



ETHIOPIC GRAMMAR.

ETHIOPIC GRAMMAR

BY

AUGUST DILLMANN

LATE PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, BERLIN.

SECOND EDITION ENLARGED AND IMPROVED (1899)

BY

CARL BEZOLD, PH. D., LL. D.

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL PHILOLOGY, HEIDELBERG.

TRANSLATED

BY

JAMES A. CRICHTON, D. D.

LONDON:

WILLIAMS & NORGATE,

14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1907.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFATORY NOTE.

The renewed interest taken in Semitic studies in general within these recent years, and in particular the continued issue from the Press of numerous and important Ethiopic texts,—encourage the hope that an English edition of the leading Ethiopic Grammar may prove not wholly unwelcome to English-speaking students at the present time. Few competent judges will challenge the claim of DILLMANN'S '*Grammar*' to be thus described. No doubt a long time has elapsed since its first publication, and much investigation has been applied to the language during the interval; but it may be questioned whether any of the essential principles laid down in DILLMANN'S work have been affected by these labours, otherwise than by way of confirmation, or whether any facts of really fundamental grammatical importance have been added to our knowledge. Accordingly, although some useful smaller Grammars now exist,—notably the excellent manual published in 1886 by PROF. PRAETORIUS—, the serious student of Ethiopic must still have recourse to DILLMANN'S work, particularly in the form given to it in the second edition (of 1899) by PROF. BEZOLD. It is from that edition that the present translation has been rendered.

It is not contended, in the light of recent research, that DILLMANN was invariably happy in his frequent excursions into the fascinating but treacherous field of Comparative Semitic; but even when his conjectural etymologies seem farthest astray, they are always stimulating and ingenious. It has been thought right, however, in this connection, to append here and there a cautionary footnote, when the author appears to give play too freely to his imagination. Farther, DILLMANN'S criticisms of the results obtained by his great predecessor LUDOLF are often severe, seldom generous, and occasionally unfair and even inaccurate. Several instances are pointed out in the footnotes. But, with all due deduction

made for such blemishes, DILLMANN'S work remains a monument—second only to his '*Lexicon*',—of his genius, industry and special erudition. It may be relied on as a safe guide through the mazes of a difficult speech; and as an institutional work, the foremost in its department, it is entitled to a high rank among the leading Semitic Grammars.

Little or no alteration has been made on the text in the course of translation. I have ventured only to cite a few additional examples, in the Syntax, from some of the more recently published Ethiopic works, inserting them either tacitly in the text itself, or avowedly in the footnotes. The somewhat meagre Table of Contents, given in the German edition, has been considerably expanded; and the details have been applied marginally, in their proper places, throughout the book. A few additions have been made in the first of the appended Tables of Forms; and an Index of Passages has been drawn up and placed at the end of the volume. As far as possible, the supporting-passages have been re-verified. In particular the quotations adduced from the important text of *Henoch*, as edited by DILLMANN, have been compared with the corresponding passages in FLEMMING'S more recent and more accurate edition; and the differences, when of any importance, have been pointed out in footnotes⁽¹⁾. This course was considered preferable to applying in the body of the work the improved readings presented in FLEMMING'S edition, or the suggestions made by DUENSING in his careful discussion of FLEMMING'S *Henoch*, contributed to the "Gelehrte Anzeigen", 1903, No. 8 (Göttingen).

It would be difficult to exaggerate my indebtedness to the distinguished scholar who prepared the last German edition, PROF. BEZOLD of Heidelberg. From the first he took a lively interest in the version. It was submitted to him in manuscript, and his suggestions were attended to. He had the great kindness also to incorporate, at that time, numerous illustrative passages

(¹) Just as these lines go to the Press, another edition of the text of *Henoch*, by PROF. CHARLES, is announced as immediately forthcoming. DR. CHARLES has already done excellent work in this field,—witness his elaborate translation and commentary: '*The Book of Enoch*', Oxford 1893. I am sorry to have missed seeing his edition of the text, in time to compare, in the following pages, as occasion might arise and grammatical interest demand, the readings of this new edition with FLEMMING'S readings.

from his admirable edition of the very important text of *Kebra Nagast*, then passing through the Press, and to enrich the version farther by adding many most useful philological and bibliographical footnotes. I have also to express here my sincere gratitude for the unfailing courtesy and patience with which he lent his invaluable assistance in the reading of the final proof-sheets. PROF. BEZOLD's direct contributions are enclosed in square brackets, both in the text and in the footnotes,—with the exception that I am responsible for a few bracketed words of a purely explanatory nature, which occur here and there in the text. My own footnotes are marked by square brackets enclosing the letters 'TR'.

I have also to thank the staff of the DRUGULIN house for the successful accomplishment of their difficult task in printing this edition.

James A. Erichton.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

A fresh treatment of Ethiopic Grammar had for a long time been urgently required; and, so far as known to me, none of the older qualified scholars seemed disposed to supply the want. In these circumstances I readily responded to an invitation addressed to me by the publishing firm in the summer of 1855, to undertake this business, — one quite as laborious as remunerative. I was aware indeed that, if only a larger number of texts had been thoroughly investigated and settled, and greater progress had been made with the deciphering of the Himyaric monuments, many details would have allowed of more certain and complete recognition and acceptance. Seeing however that the accomplishment of these tasks lay still in the distant future, I did not think it wise to wait for it; and, even as it was, a rich field, ripe for cutting and gathering in, already lay before me.

The terms of my arrangement with the publisher restricted, to some extent, the time available for work, and also the compass of the volume. Still, I have endeavoured to satisfy, as far as possible within the prescribed limits, those requirements of a grammatical work which are insisted on by our advanced philology. The material of the language has been thoroughly gone over afresh, in all its parts and on every side; and many new observations, of which LUDOLF had no presentiment, have been the result, as every single section of the book will show. In explaining the phenomena of the language and duly ranking them in its system, I was still more completely left to my own enquiries, as foregoing labours in this department have been much more scanty. Many things here are, of course, matter of grammatical theory previously adopted, so that others, who profess a different theory will attempt a different explanation. Many things, — in the views given of Pronunciation and Accent for instance, — must per-

haps always remain uncertain and obscure, because the historical information, which alone could decide, is wanting. Many things too had to be set down without being fully demonstrated, because space was not obtainable for their proper discussion. In the references mentioned, it is but desirable that other scholars should now speak out, and take up the discussion of these more difficult and obscure questions. Science, — to the service of which alone this book is devoted, would be a gainer. But every one who peruses my book will be convinced, I trust, that Ethiopic grammar, which has been neglected so long, sheds quite as much light on the grammars of the other Semitic languages as it receives from them.

Perhaps some justification is required for the great length at which, in the Phonology, I have sought to authenticate by examples the Sound-transitions between Ethiopic roots and those of the other Semitic tongues. I know from experience the perplexing effect, which is produced upon one who approaches Ethiopic from the side of the other Semitic languages, caused by a host of expressions and roots; and therefore I wished to clear the way for a more thorough insight, by discussing a number of etymologies, and by analysing the Sound-changes upon which this phenomenon rests. Much here is, of course, merely matter of conjecture and must long remain so, — in fact until dialectic phonetic interchange is more strictly investigated by Semitic philologists, and traced back to sure principles. However, even the danger of falling into error here and there in detail, did not prevent me from tackling the matter.

In the Syntax I was obliged to compress my work, seeing that the space allowed was already more than exhausted. Accordingly it was only what was peculiar and remarkable in Ethiopic that I was able to treat with any thoroughness; while I could merely touch upon what had become familiar from the other Semitic languages. In the arrangement of the Syntax I have adhered almost entirely to the order adopted in EWALD's '*Hebrew Grammar*', which seemed to be the most accurate and suitable. Altogether this part of the work, for which LUDOLF did almost nothing, claims to be no more than a first draught, which still awaits much filling in by means of farther studies. A few paragraphs I would gladly have altered, if the manuscript had not by

that time left my hands. Then too, the Sections turned out somewhat unequal in extent; but, on account of the constant references backwards and forwards, it had become exceedingly difficult to make any alteration in this respect.

The supporting-passages I have taken, as far as possible, from the Bible in print, and in this I have founded upon PLATT's edition of the New Testament, LUDOLF's of the Psalms, LAURENCE's of 4 Esra, and my own edition of the Octateuch and the Book of Henoch. Quotations are occasionally made from Manuscript sources in the case of the other Biblical Books, as well as in the case of the Book of Jubilees, (*Kufālē*), Vita Adami, (*Gadla Adām*), Liturgies, Organon, Hymnologies of the British Bible Society, Abyssinian Chronicles and Šalōta Reqēt.

It is hoped that every foreigner will kindly excuse, and every German approve of, my having written the book in German: to write a Grammar in Latin is restricting and troublesome, and to read it is pain.

It seemed to me unnecessary in itself to add an Index of Words and Subjects, and it was besides precluded by my having already exceeded the limits allowed the book.

Kiel, 15th April, 1857.

The Author.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The highly honouring proposal was made to me on the part of the Publishing firm, at the suggestion of PROF. NÖLDEKE, and with the sanction of the Author's representatives, to prepare a second edition of the present work. A wish which had been cherished for many years by the Author, who has been removed from us, was thereby to be fulfilled. PROF. DILLMANN had gathered together a large number of notes in his own interleaved copy of the Grammar with a view to a revised edition, and had continued the process till shortly before his death. A foundation was thus laid for the present edition, which, at the express desire of the representatives, takes, upon the whole, the form of a reproduction of the original work, with the author's numerous additions and relatively few emendations.

In consequence of the restriction thus laid upon me in the work of revisal, the original character of the book has been absolutely preserved. But another consequence of course was, that it became impossible for the new editor to undertake any thorough-going alterations in individual passages. PROF. DILLMANN himself, if it had been permitted him, would doubtless have undertaken a much more vigorous recasting or regular revision of the book. Beyond trifling alterations of expression, and the tacit correction of manifest errors of the Press, I have merely rectified certain mistakes, — proved by facts to be such, — and which DILLMANN would at this time of day have acknowledged. The entire responsibility, as well as the entire merit, accordingly remains with the Author, even in this second edition. My contributions — in the way of correction of the original work and addition of a few notices of the literature of the subject — are marked by square brackets.

I thought I might venture upon greater liberty in the use made of the Author's Manuscript additions. In particular, the

lengthy and frequently recurring extracts from later writings, — which DILLMANN had entered in his copy, manifestly for his own readier guidance, — have been replaced by mere references to the works concerned: other material too, especially all that seemed to lie beyond the scope of an Ethiopic grammar, has been left out of account. On the other hand I considered that I was acting in the spirit of the Author in endeavouring to extend, support and adjust the lists of examples, often very briefly stated by him, and in many cases consisting of a single Ethiopic word, — a labour which was facilitated, and in many cases in fact made possible, only through DILLMANN's '*Lexicon Linguae Ethiopicae*'. Occasionally, instead of a long series of supporting-passages I have given a direct reference to the '*Lexicon*'.

The now antiquated second Table of the first edition, with the "older Forms of Ethiopic writing", has been set aside for various reasons.

A few additions, marked "NÖLDEKE", originated in the course of reading the proof-sheets, which PROF. NÖLDEKE revised at my request on account of the extensions of the new edition springing out of DILLMANN's copy. Of course the distinguished scholar just named does not thereby incur any responsibility for my performance. But, beyond an honest endeavour to restore as well as I could the work of the much revered dead, it was *his* lively interest in this work and *his* continual assistance with head and hand, which alone gave me the needful courage to undertake the task and to conduct it to its close. For this service I hope he will kindly accept here my heartfelt thanks.

Lugano, 25th April, 1899.

C. Bezold.

NOTE ON THE ENGLISH EDITION.

It is with great pleasure that I avail myself of the opportunity, here afforded me, of expressing my thorough approval of DR. CRICHTON'S translation of DILLMANN'S work, which will form a worthy companion-volume to his recent edition of PROF. NÖLDEKE'S '*Syriac Grammar*'. The clear and idiomatic English, into which DILLMANN'S rather difficult German has been rendered, testifies once more to DR. CRICHTON'S ability and skill in such translation, as well as to the minute and conscientious accuracy, combined with sound scholarship, with which he has undertaken and brought to a successful completion his laborious task. I venture to hope and believe that DILLMANN'S book will henceforth appeal with effect to a still wider circle of readers, and increase yet farther the interest taken in Ethiopic Grammar among English-speaking students of Semitic.

Heidelberg, November 1906.

C. Bezold.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE.

	Page
§ 1. Sketch of the History of the Language	1
Its Name	3
§ 2. Origin and Character	3
§ 3. Close Affinities with Arabic:—Resemblances and Differences . .	4
§ 4. Development of the Language	7
§ 5. Changes in its Phonetic System and Vocabulary	9
§ 6. Ethiopic Literature. Modern Investigations	11

PART FIRST. ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY.

I. ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 7. Minao-Sabaic Origin of the Alphabetic Characters	15
§ 8. Number of the Consonants	16
§ 9. Names of the Consonants	17
§ 10. Order of the Ethiopic Alphabet	18
§ 11. Form of the Script. Direction of Writing	21

Vowel Denotation.

§ 12. Vowel Denotation incorporated with Consonantal Script . . .	23
§ 13. Short <i>ä</i> assumed as present in Consonantal Ground-form . . .	26
Discussion of the Indication of Short Vowels other than <i>ä</i> , and of the Absence of a Vowel	26
§ 14. Forms of the Consonants to indicate the Presence of the <i>five</i> Long Vowels severally	27
Forms indicating the Presence of a Short Vowel other than <i>ä</i> , or Absence of a Vowel	29
§ 15. Development of the <i>U</i> -containing Letters, and their several Forms	31
§ 16. Interpunctuation-marks. Numerical Signs	32

II. PHONOLOGY.

I. THE SOUNDS (OR LETTERS) OF THE LANGUAGE.

1. VOWELS.

	Page
§ 17. Preliminary Observations. Short Vowels other than <i>ǎ</i>	34
§ 18. The Ground-vowel, Short <i>ǎ</i>	35
Long <i>ā</i>	36
§ 19. Short, indeterminate <i>č</i>	37
§ 20. <i>ī</i> and <i>ū</i>	39
§ 21. <i>ē</i> and <i>ō</i>	39
§ 22. Pronunciation of fugitive <i>č</i>	41

2. CONSONANTS.

§ 23. Preliminary Observations	42
§ 24. Gutturals (Aspirate-)	44
§ 25. The firmer Gutturals (Palatal-)	48
§ 26. The <i>U</i> -containing Gutturals	50
§ 27. Dental-Lingual Mutes	54
§ 28. Labial Mutes	56
§ 29. No distinction recognised between an Aspirated (or Assibilated) and an Unaspirated pronunciation of Mutes	59
§ 30. Sibilants	59
§ 31. Fluctuation and Interchange of Sibilants	61
§ 32. The Liquid and Softer Letters: Nasals; Linguals; and Semivowels	65

II. MEETING OF LETTERS IN THE SYLLABLE AND IN THE WORD.

General Rules of the Syllable.

§ 33. Constitution of the Syllable	67
§ 34. Beginning of the Syllable	68
§ 35. Termination of the Syllable	70

CHANGES OF LETTERS CONSEQUENT ON THE GENERAL RULES OF THE SYLLABLE, OR ON THEIR MEETING WITH OTHER LETTERS.

1. VOWELS.

(A) INFLUENCE OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE SYLLABLE AND THE WORD ON THE VOWELS.

§ 36. Shortening of Long Vowels. Lengthening of Short Vowels	71
Weakening and reducing of Vowels	73
§ 37. Treatment of Short <i>č</i> , under change of Syllabic Conditions	73
§ 38. Treatment of Short <i>č</i> , at the end of Nominal Stems	74

(B) MEETING OF VOWELS.

	Page
§ 39. Contraction and Coalescing	77
§ 40. Hardening of Vowel into Semivowel	79
§ 41. Interpolation of Separating Consonant	81
Displacing of one Vowel by another	82
§ 42. Meeting of the <i>u</i> of <i>U</i> -containing Gutturals with certain Vowels	82

(C) MEETING OF VOWELS AND CONSONANTS, AND THEIR INTER-CHANGES.

(α) *Influence of Aspirates on the Vowels.*

§ 43. Close relation of Vowels and Aspirates	83
Aspirate must have a Vowel directly next it	84
§ 44. Preference of Aspirates for the <i>a</i> -sound	85
§ 45. Reduction of <i>ā</i> of open Syllable preceding Aspirate, to <i>ē</i> in certain cases	86
§ 46. Lengthening of Vowel preceding Aspirate in the same Syllable	87
§ 47. Occasional Disappearance of Aspirates	90
§ 48. Aspirates and the Word-Tone	91
h passing into a Semivowel	92

(β) *The Vowels I and U and the Semivowels.*

§ 49. Hardening of <i>i</i> and <i>u</i> , as 1 st Radicals, into Semivowels	93
§ 50. Vowel-Pronunciation of <i>i</i> and <i>u</i> as 2 nd Radicals	94
§ 51. Hardening of <i>i</i> and <i>u</i> as 3 rd Radicals	95
§ 52. Radical <i>ī</i> or <i>ū</i> meeting with Formative Vowel <i>ī</i> or <i>ū</i>	97
§ 53. Rejection of <i>u</i> (and <i>i</i>)	99

2. CONSONANTS.

§ 54. Doubling of Consonant as Result of Assimilation	101
§ 55. Doubling of Consonant, to make up for shortening preceding Vowel	104
Doubled Consonant always written in Single Form	104
§ 56. Giving up the Doubling	105
Occasional Compensation for Loss of the Doubling	106
§ 57. Exchange of Consonants. Transposition	107
§ 58. Interpolation or Rejection of individual Consonants	108
Softening of Consonants into Vowels	109

III. THE WORD AND THE TONE OF THE WORD.

§ 59. The Tone of the Word, and its Adjustment	110
§ 60. Vocalisation of the Word, as influenced by the Tone	112

PART SECOND. MORPHOLOGY.

A. ROOTS:—THEIR CLASSES AND THEIR FORMS.

§ 61. Interjections	114
§ 62. Pronominal Roots:—Demonstratives	115
§ 63. Interrogatives	118

	Page
§ 64. Pronominal Roots:—Relative Pronouns	119
§ 65. Personal Pronouns	120
§ 66. Conceptional Roots.—General Description	122
§ 67. Tri-radical Roots:—Strong Roots	125
Weak Roots	125
Roots <i>med. gem.</i>	125
Roots <i>med. inf.</i>	126
§ 68. Vowel-sided Roots:—Vowel-beginning Roots	127
Vowel-ending Roots	128
§ 69. Doubly Weak Roots	129
§ 70. Certain Strong Ethiopic Roots compared with corresponding but Weak Roots in kindred Languages	130
§ 71. Multiliteral Roots: (<i>a</i>) Originating in repetition of Individual Rad., or of the whole Root	131
§ 72. M. R.: (<i>b</i>) Originating in Interpolation of Firm Letter after 1 st Rad.	134
§ 73. M. R.: (<i>c</i>) Derived from Triliteral Roots and Words, by External Application of Formative Letter	135

B. FORMATION OF WORDS.

§ 74. Methods followed generally in Word-Formation. Division of Words into:—1. Verbs; 2. Nouns; 3. Particles	138
---	-----

FORMATION OF VERBS.

I. STEM-FORMATION OF VERBS.

§ 75. General Description of Verbal Stems	140
---	-----

1. STEM-FORMATION OF TRI-RADICAL ROOTS.

§ 76. Scheme of Stems. I. Ground-Stems:—1. The Simple Stem.	141
Transitive and Intransitive Forms	142
§ 77. 2. The Intensive Stem	143
§ 78. 3. The Influencing Stem	146
§ 79. II. Causative Stems:—	148
1. Causative of the Simple Stem	148
2. Causative of the Intensive Stem	150
3. Causative of the Influencing Stem	150
§ 80. III. Reflexive-Passive Stems:—	151
1. R.-P. of the Simple Stem	151
§ 81. 2. R.-P. of the Intensive Stem	153
§ 82. 3. Reflexive of the Influencing Stem:—Stem of Reciprocity	154
§ 83. IV. Causative-Reflexive Stems:—	156
Causative-Reflexive Stems 1 & 2	158
§ 84. Causative-Reflexive Stem 3	159

2. STEM-FORMATION OF MULTILITERAL ROOTS.

§ 85. Scheme of Stems	161
I. Ground-Stem	161

		Page
	II. Causative Stem	162
§ 86.	III. Passive-Reflexive Stems	163
	IV. Causative-Reflexive Stems	164
§ 87.	V. Second Reflexive Stem	164

II. FORMATION OF TENSES AND MOODS.

§ 88.	General Remarks.—Uses of the Perfect	166
§ 89.	Uses of the Imperfect	169
§ 90.	Derivation of the Moods from the Imperfect Tense	173
§ 91.	General Rules of Formation in the Perfect and Imperfect Tenses	174
	Older Form of Imperfect Tense used as the Subjunctive Mood.—Fuller Form as the pure Imperfect (= the Indicative Mood)	176
§ 92.	Tense and Mood Formation in—1. Simple Ground-Stem.—Transitive and Intransitive Pronunciation	177
	T. and M. Formation of Aspirate Verbs	178
§ 93.	T. and M. Formation of Weak Verbs:—Verbs <i>med. gem.</i>	180
	Verbs <i>prim. voc.</i>	180
	Verbs <i>med. inf.</i>	181
§ 94.	Weak Verbs continued:—Verbs <i>tert. inf.</i>	183
	Verbs Doubly Weak	184
§ 95.	Tense and Mood Formation in—2. Intensive Ground-Stem	185
	T. and M. Formation in—3. Influencing Ground-Stem	186
§ 96.	II. T. and M. Formation in Causative Stems	187
§ 97.	III. T. and M. Formation in Reflexive Stems	191
§ 98.	IV. T. and M. Formation in Causative-Reflexive Stems	195
§ 99.	Tense and Mood Formation of Multiliteral Verbs:—	197
	I. In Ground-Stem	198
	II. In Causative Stem	199
§ 100.	III. T. and M. Formation in Reflexive Stems of Multiliteral Verbs	200
	IV. In Causative-Reflexive Stems	200
	V. In Second Reflexive Stem	200

III. FORMATION OF PERSONS, GENDERS AND NUMBERS.

§ 101.	General Remarks	201
	1. Personal Signs of the Perfect	202
	2. Personal Signs of the Imperfect—(Indicative and Subjunctive)	203
§ 102.	Attachment of Personal Signs in the Perfect	205
§ 103.	Attachment of Personal Signs in the Imperfect—(Indicative and Subjunctive)	209

OF NOUNS.

3—IN THE NARROWER
THE TERM.

ON OF NOUNS.

	Page
of Stem-Formation	212

INAL STEMS.

<i>ion</i> ,—with accented Short Vowel	215
cented Short Vowel or Tone-long	220
ed as Verbal Nouns from the m):—	220
e ē after 2 nd Radical, but now id Accent on the 1 st Syllable	220
er 2 nd Radical	222
as Verbal Adjectives and Parti-	225
.	226
.	226
.	227
owels long from the first:—	229
al (and ē after 2 nd)	229
Radical (and a after 1 st)	230

7 DOUBLING OF RADICALS, OR
S AND MULTILITERAL ROOTS.

Verbal Stems:—

med by doubling 2 nd Rad., with nd Rad., and a after 1 st	231
Reduplication of both the last a the last Syllable and a in the	232
ems:— (a) Conceptional Words, tem,—with a after 2 nd Rad., and em.-ending ā	232
sive Stems,—with ā after 2 nd Rad., g formed by ta closed by 1 st Rad.	234
tive Words from Derived Stems,—	236
: (a) Simple Conceptional Words	236
as have short ě	237
as have short ā	237
ble has ā, and the first either ā or ě	237

	Page
(b) Descriptive Words, and Substantives derived from them	238
(c) Stronger Conceptional Words (<i>Nomina Actionis</i>), with <i>ā</i> in the last Syllable, and <i>a</i> in the preceding one . . .	239

3. NOMINAL STEMS OF OUTER FORMATION.

(a) *Forms reached by means of Prefixes.*

§ 113.	With the Prefix h	239
	With the Prefix <i>ma</i> , (1) in Participles from Derived Active Stems, Part. Act. having <i>e</i> in last Syllable, and Part. Pass. <i>a</i> :—	240
§ 114.	Participial formation with <i>ma</i> ,—(a) from St. I, 2	241
	" " " " (b) from St. I, 3	242
	" " " " (c) from St. II, 1	242
	" " " " (d) from St. II, 2	242
	" " " " (e) from St. IV, 1, 2, 3	242
	" " " " (f) from Active Stems of Multi-literal Verbs	243
§ 115.	Prefix <i>ma</i> , (2) in the formation of Names of Things,	
	(a) to express the <i>Place of the Action</i>	244
§ 116.	(b) To express the <i>Implement</i> or the <i>Products of the Action</i> , or the <i>Action itself</i> :—	245
	(a) Formation with <i>a</i> in 2 nd Syllable	246
	(β) Formation with <i>e</i> in 2 nd Syllable	247
	(γ) Prefix <i>ma</i> reduced to <i>mē</i> in 1 st Syllable, with <i>ā</i> , <i>ā</i> or <i>ē</i> in 2 nd Syllable	248

(b) *Forms reached by means of Affixes.*

§ 117.	Denominative Nouns:—1. Adjective-Formation:	
	(a) with termination <i>ī</i> :—	249
	(a) With <i>ī</i> attached to Nouns of the Type <i>gabbār</i> , or from any of the Derived Stems	250
§ 118.	(β) With <i>ī</i> attached to Participles formed by means of <i>ma</i> , turning them into <i>Nomina Agentis</i>	251
	(γ) With <i>ī</i> attached to Proper Names and a few Personal Words and Names of Things	252
§ 119.	Adjective Formation: (b) with termination <i>āwī</i> , in the derivation, from Substantives and Adjectives, of New Adjectives and Words indicating Persons	253
	Shorter Ending <i>āī</i> , alternating with <i>āwī</i> , at least in Numeral Adjectives	254
§ 120.	2. Abstract Nouns formed from Words with these Adj.-Endings, by appending Fem.-Sign; (a) as <i>īt</i> ,—sometimes as <i>ūt</i> —	254
	(b) Oftener as <i>ēt</i> or <i>ē</i> : Abstracts in <i>ēt</i> ; Conceptional Words in <i>ē</i> , from Verbal Stems	255
§ 121.	(c) Forms, chiefly Infinitives, in accented <i>ōt</i> and <i>ō</i>	257
	(d) Nouns of Circumstance and Condition in Tone-bearing <i>āt</i>	258
§ 122.	(e) Abstract Forms in <i>ān</i> or <i>ōn</i> , and <i>nā</i>	259
	No special Form for Diminutives; nor any true Compounds	261

PARTICIPLES AND INFINITIVES.

	Page
§ 123. <i>Participles</i> : General Remarks.—Comparative Failure of Regular Participial Forms	262
Compensated partly 1.—By the Gerund; 2.—By Periphrasis in a Finite Tense	263
<i>Infinitives</i> : Distinction between <i>Nominal Infinitive</i> and <i>Verbal Infinitive</i> or <i>Gerund</i>	263
§ 124. Certain Abstract Forms sometimes employed for the Nominal Infinitive	265
Formation of the Infinitive Proper: 1. <i>The Gerund</i> in the several Stems	265
§ 125. 2. <i>The Nominal Infinitive</i> in the several Stems	268

II. FORMATION OF GENDERS AND NUMBERS.

1. GENDERS OF NOMINAL STEMS.

§ 126. The two Genders: Masculine and Feminine. Signs of the Feminine	271
§ 127. Feminine Endings and the Mode of their Attachment in the case of 1. <i>Substantives</i> : (a) Ending <i>at</i>	274
(b) Ending <i>ā</i>	275
(c) Ending <i>ē</i>	277
§ 128. (d) Closely attached and Consonantal Ending <i>†</i>	277
§ 129. 2. Feminine of Adjectives and Participles:—	
(a) By Interpolation of <i>ā</i> in the Stem	279
(b) Outer Formation by the Ending <i>†</i>	281
§ 130. The Gender-usage in Ethiopic	283

2. NUMBERS OF NOMINAL STEMS.

§ 131. Numbers of Nominal Stems.—Faint Traces of a Dual	286
1. Contrast between Class-Word and Word denoting an Individual of the Class (<i>Generalis</i> and <i>Nomen Unitatis</i>)	287
2. Contrast between Singular and Plural (<i>One</i> and <i>More than One</i>)	288
Special Uses of certain Plurals.	289

(a) *Outer Formation of the Plural.*

§ 132. Masculine Plural Ending in <i>án</i> ; Fem. in <i>át</i>	290
1. Personal and Descriptive Words taking Outer Plural Ending <i>án</i> . Detailed Rules and Exceptions (<i>α—g</i>)	291
§ 133. 2. Substantives taking Outer Plural Ending <i>āt</i> :—	
(a) Certain Masc. Personal Names	294
(b) Singular Fem. Forms taking <i>āt</i> in Plural	295
§ 134. (c) Many Masc. Singular-Stems taking Outer Plural Ending <i>āt</i> (<i>α—γ</i>)	296
(d) Nominal Stems with Prefix <i>ḥ</i> , which sometimes take the Outer Formation in the Plural	299

(b) *Inner Formation of the Plural.*

	Page
§ 135. General Account of the Inner Plural or Collective Form . . .	299
§ 136. I. Collective Words from Singular-Stems of the Simplest Formation from Tri-radical Roots	301
1. Collective-form, Type ግበር (<i>gěbār</i>)	301
2. Collective-form, Type አግበር (<i>agbār</i>)	302
§ 137. 3. Collective-form, Type አግቡር (<i>agbūr</i>)	304
4. Collective-form, Type አግበር (<i>ágběr</i>)	305
5. Collective-form, Type አግበርት (<i>agbért</i>)	305
§ 138. II. Collective Words from certain longer Singular-Stems of Tri-radical Roots,—the Collective-form being of the Type ግበርት (<i>gabárt</i>)	307
§ 139. III. Collective Words from longer Stems of Triliteral and Multiliteral Roots, Type ግበርር (<i>găbărčr</i>):—	308
1. Collective-forms from various Nominal Stems of Multiliteral Roots	309
2. Collective-forms from Nominal Stems which have Prefixes (<i>a—c</i>)	310
§ 140. 3 Same Formation occurring with many Nom. Stems of Tri-rad. Roots which have a long Vowel after 1 st or 2 nd Rad., or have a Vowel-termination (<i>a—c</i>)	311
IV. Traces of a Collective Formation, contrived by applying Abstract Terminations proper to Fem. Sing.	314
§ 141. (c) <i>Plurals of Plurals.</i>	314

III. FORMATION OF CASES.

§ 142. 1. The Nominative and Vocative	317
§ 143. 2. The Accusative:—Usual Marking. When such Marking is not exhibited	320
§ 144. 3. The Genitive Relation:—(a) The Construct State	324
§ 145. (b) Periphrastic Indication of the Genitive by Prefixing Rel. Pron. to Determining Word	326

B. PRONOUNS AND NUMERALS.

I. PRONOUNS.

§ 146. I. <i>Pronouns</i> :—1. Demonstrative Pronouns	328
§ 147. 2. Relative and Interrogative Pronouns	332
§ 148. 3. Personal Pronouns.—(a) The Third Pers. Pron.	336
(b) The Second Pers. Pron.	338
(c) The First Pers. Pron.	338
§ 149. Formation of the Accusative and Genitive in the Pers. Prons. .	338
<i>Suffix Pronouns</i>	339
§ 150. Expression of the Acc., Gen. and Nom. of a Pers. Pron., on which a Special Emphasis rests. (a) <i>Emphatic Acc.-form of Pers. Pron.</i> .	341
(b) <i>Emphatic Gen.-form of Pers. Pron.</i> .	342
(c) <i>Emphatic Nom.-form of Pers. Pron.</i> .	343
Reflexive use of ርእስ and ሃላስ with Suff. Pron.	345

	Page
§ 151. <i>Attachment of Verbal Suffixes. Binding-vowel</i>	345
1. Attachment when Pers. Forms of the Verb end in a Consonant	347
2. When they end in <i>ǎ</i>	347
3. Attachment when Pers. Forms end in formative- <i>ū</i>	348
4. When they end in Fem.-formative- <i>ī</i>	348
5. When they end in <i>ā</i>	349
§ 152. <i>Special Cases of the Attachment of Verbal Suffixes</i>	349
§ 153. <i>Attachment of Nominal Suffixes. Binding-vowel</i>	351
1. Attachment of Suffixes to <i>Plural Forms</i>	352
§ 154. 2. Attachment of Suffixes to <i>Singular Forms</i> :—	
(a) To Nominal Stems ending in <i>ā, ē</i> or <i>ō</i>	354
(b) To Nominal Stems ending in a Consonant;	
(α) when these Stems stand in the <i>Accusative</i>	354
(β) When they stand in the <i>Nominative</i>	356
(c) To Nouns ending in <i>ī</i>	356
(d) To certain Short and Old Words	357
§ 155. 3. Suffixes often attached to Singular Stems in the Plural fashion, and to Plural Stems in the Singular fashion; (a) 1 st case when the Sing. Stems are similar in form or meaning to Plurals	358
(b) 2 nd case, when the Pl. Stems may be conceived of as suggesting Unity	359
4. Suffixes applied to the Infinitive	359
§ 156. Use of the Suffix in certain cases, equivalent to Apposition	359

II. PRONOMINALS.

§ 157. II. <i>Pronominals</i> :—1. Compounds of Pronouns and Conceptional Words taking the place held by Pronominals in other Languages	361
2. Conceptional Words, used only when compounded with Suff. Prons.	361

III. NUMERALS.

§ 158. III. <i>Numerals</i> :—1. <i>Cardinal Numbers</i>	364
2. <i>Derived Numerals</i> :—(a) Ordinal Numbers	369
(b) Number of the Day of the Week or Month	370
(c) Multiplicatives	371
(d) Abstract Numerals	372
(e) Numeral Adverbs	372
(f) Fractional Numbers	373
(g) Distributives	373
(h) Expressions for <i>πρῶτον, δεύτερον, τρίτον</i>	375

FORMATION OF WORDS OF RELATION.

I. ADVERBS.

1. ADVERBS DERIVED FROM PRONOMINAL ROOTS.

§ 160. 1. Adverbs of Demonstrative Meaning:—	
(a) Particles of Demonstrative force	375
(b) Independent Adverbs of Place and Time	377

§ 161.	2. Interrogative Adverbs and Adverbs of Relative Meaning:—	
	(a) Interrogative Adverbs	378
	(b) Relative Adverbs	380
§ 162.	3. Negative, Affirmative, Exclamatory and Restrictive Particles, together with certain Enclitics	380

2. ADVERBS DERIVED FROM CONCEPTIONAL WORDS.

§ 163. 1. Adverbs of Place and Time (*Acc. of Noun*); of Kind and Manner (*Acc. of Adj.*); and Adverbs formed by prefixing Prepositions to Substantives or Adjectives, instead of taking *Acc.* 383

2. Other forms of Adverbs, being originally Nouns, with or without inflection, or with special terminations 385

3. Adverbial Notions expressed by Verbs 387

4. Adverbial Indication of the Language in which anything is spoken or written 388

II. PREPOSITIONS.

§ 164.	General Account of Prepositions	388
	(a) The Prepositions in most frequent use:—1. и . . .	389
	2. а . . .	391
	3. за . . .	392
§ 165.	(b) The other more frequently used Prepositions (4—10) . . .	394
§ 166.	Prepositions (Class <i>b</i>) continued (11—23)	399
	(c) Words occurring as Prepositions, but less frequently (24—38)	404
§ 167.	Attachment of Suffixes to Prepositions	406

III. CONJUNCTIONS.

§ 168.	General Account of Conjunctions	410
	1. Copulative, Disjunctive, Adversative and Restrictive Conjunctions (1—9)	411
§ 169.	2. Inferential, Causal and Final Conjunctions (1—10)	414
§ 170.	3. Conjunctions expressing Conditional and Temporal Relations (1—10)	417
§ 171.	Prevalence and Force of Prefix- and Affix-Particles in Ethiopic	420

PART THIRD. SYNTAX.

A. LEADING WORD-GROUPS OF THE SENTENCE.

I. PERIPHRAISIS OF THE ARTICLE.

§ 172. *Subject and Predicate.* I. Periphrasis of the Article:—
1. Methods of indicating *Definiteness* in the Noun 423
§ 173. 2. Methods of indicating *Indefiniteness* in the Noun 426

II. GOVERNMENT OF THE VERB.

1. NOUNS AND PRONOUNS IN SUBORDINATION TO THE VERB.

	(a) <i>The Verbal Object expressed by the Accusative.</i>	Page
§ 174.	Accusative of an associated <i>Nomen</i> as determining the idea of the Verb. 1.— <i>Accusative of Determination</i> :—	
	(a) Adverbial Accusative of Kind and Manner	430
	(b) Accusative of Place and Time	431
	(c) Accusative of Measure	432
§ 175.	2.— <i>Accusative of Purport or Reference</i> :—	
	(a) Emphatic Acc. of Derived Noun, or Noun of Kindred Meaning	432
	(b) Acc. of Related Noun, with Verbs of Plenty and Want &c.	433
	(c) Accusative of Relation or Limitation	434
§ 176.	3.— <i>Accusative of the Object Proper</i> , with Verbs of various meaning (a—h)	435
§ 177.	4.— <i>Double Accusative</i> (a—g). <i>Triple Accusative</i>	438
	5.— <i>Accusative after Reflexive Verbs, and after the Passives of Verbs which govern two Accusatives</i>	440
	<i>Accusative after Verbs of Being, Becoming &c.</i>	441
§ 178.	6.— <i>Suffix Pronoun used as a Secondary Accusative or a Dative of Special Reference</i>	442
§ 179.	(b) <i>Subordination of Nouns and Pronouns by means of Prepositions</i>	445

2. VERB IN SUBORDINATION TO THE VERB.

§ 180.	1. Second Verb determining (a) Kind and Manner, Circumstances or Time of the action of the First:—	448
	(a) By the two Verbs being set side by side without и	448
	(β) By the Verb of Principal Action being subordinated in the Acc. of the Inf. to the Verb of Circumstance or Time	449
§ 181.	Second Verb expressing (b) more exact Determination of Time, Circumstance &c.:—(α) By the Gerund	450
	(β) By the Imperfect without и	451
	(γ) Qualifying Verb being introduced by Conjunction, such as какъ &c.	452
	(δ) When the Qualifying Verb is represented by the Subst.-Inf. of Principal Verb	452
§ 182.	2. Second Verb determining the Contents of the Leading Verb:—	
	(a, α) In the form of the Acc. of the Subst.-Inf. of Subordinate Verb; (β) in the form of a Finite Verb introduced by a Conjunction	453
	(b) Forms adopted by Second Verb to express intended Result or Aim of Principal Verb:—(α) Subst.-Inf. with а prefixed; (β) Subjunctive without Conjunction	456
	(γ) Subjunctive with Conjunction	457
	(δ) Usage with Verbs of Beginning and Ceasing	457

§ 183.	3. Second Verb as Remote Object, specifying Direction, Purpose or Consequence of Principal Action:—(a) In the Infinitive	458
	(b) In the Subjunctive without Conjunction	458
	(c) In the Subjunctive with hoo	459
4.	Second Verb subordinated as Subst.-Inf., with the help of Prepositions	459

III. COMBINATION OF NOUNS WITH ONE ANOTHER.

1. SUBORDINATION OF NOUNS.

(a) *The Genitive Relation.*

§ 184.	(a) The Genitive Relation:—1. <i>The Construct State</i>	459
	(a) Relation of Possession	460
	(b) Genitive of Limitation	461
	(c) Genitive denoting Material or Origin	462
	(d) Genitive indicating other Determinations of Condition	463
§ 185.	Rules observed in the use of the Constr. St. Relation	464
§ 186.	2. Periphrastic Indication of the Genitive:—	
	(a) By means of H , h3t , hA	468
	(b) By means of A	470
	(c) By h3h , to express the Partitive Genitive	471

(b) *Subordination through the Accusative or through Prepositions.*

§ 187.	(b) Subordination through the <i>Acc.</i> or through <i>Preps.</i> :—	
	1. Infinitives and Certain Descriptive Words governing an Accusative	472
	2. Conceptional and Descriptive Words, supplemented by Noun governed by intervening Preposition	473
	3. Prepositions employed in intensifying and comparing Qualitative Conceptions	474

2. CO-ORDINATION OF NOUNS.

§ 188.	1. Co-ordination and Concord of Substantives and Demonstrative Prons., and of Substantives and Adjectives	476
§ 189.	2. Substantives in co-ordination with Substantives	480
	3. Apposition-forms in the case of the Subject or the Object of a Sentence:—	
	(a) When the Word in Apposition is a simple Substantive	481
	(b) When the Word in Apposition is an Adjective	482
	(c) When an entire Clause is in Apposition	483
§ 190.	(d) Co-ordination of Predicate-Object with immediate Object, after Verbs of Perceiving, Declaring &c.:—1. As an Accusative of the Participle	483
	2. As an Accusative of the Gerund, with or without Suffix	484
	3. As a Finite Clause introduced by h3h , and equivalent to the Participle	484

	Page
4. As an Independent Clause, subordinated directly to the Verb of Perceiving, without any Conjunction. <i>Attraction</i> . . .	485
5. As a Clause subordinated by ከመ	485
6. Predicate-Object expressed by Finite Verb in the Subjunctive, with or without ከመ , after Verbs of Causing or Making	486
§ 191. <i>Addendum: Union of Numerals and Nouns.</i> 1. Cardinal Numbers	486
2. Ordinal Numbers	489

B. STRUCTURE OF THE SIMPLE SENTENCE.

§ 192.	1. The <i>Subject</i>	490
	(a) Indefinite Mode of Expression	491
	(b) Impersonal Mode of Expression	492
	(c) Passive Construction	494
§ 193.	2. The <i>Predicate</i>	495
§ 194.	3. Union of Subject and Predicate: (a) Connecting-words when Predicate is a Noun of some kind	497
	Personal Pronoun as <i>Copula</i>	498
	Use of ሀለወ and ከኒ as Connecting-words.	499
§ 195.	(b) Agreement of Predicate with Subject in Gender and Number, when Predicate is a full Verb or an Adjective	500
§ 196.	(c) Arrangement of the Sentence:—	502
	(α) Usual Order.	503
	(β) Alteration of Usual Order, for Purposes of Emphasis	504
	(γ) Other Determining Motives	507

C. SPECIAL KINDS OF SENTENCES.

1. NEGATIVE, INTERROGATIVE, AND EXCLAMATORY SENTENCES.

§ 197.	1. Negative Sentences.—(a) With ኢ	508
	(b) With ከኮ	509
	(c) With ክልቦ	510
	(d) Various Negative Phrases	512
§ 198.	2. Interrogative Sentences.—(a) Independent Interrogation . .	513
	(b) Dependent Interrogation . .	515
	(c) Disjunctive Interrogation. . .	515
	(d) Strengthening Particles in Interrogation, and Particles of Reply	516
	(e) Definite Interrogative Words: መኩ , ምንት and others	516
§ 199.	3. Exclamatory Sentences.—(a) With a single Noun	518
	(b) With the Imperative in Affirmative Charges, and the Subjunctive in Prohibitions.	518
	(c) Entire Sentences forming the Exclamation	519
	(d) Special Words in Exclamation.	520
	(e) Optative Expressions	520
	(f) Various Exclamatory Particles	521

2. CONNECTED SENTENCES.

(a) *Copulative Clauses.*

		Page
§ 200.	1. Copulative use of ω and እንዘ , and some other Particles	521
	2. Adversative Clauses. Restrictive and Intensifying Additions to the Sentence	525
	3. Causal and Inferential Expressions	527

(b) *Attributive Relative Clauses.*

§ 201.	1. Presence or Absence of Introductory Relative Pronoun .	527
	(a) When Rel. Pronoun is present, Supporting-Noun is sometimes merely understood	528
	(b) Usages when Supporting-Noun is expressly mentioned. <i>Attraction</i> of Noun	529 530
§ 202.	2. Expression of Case-relations of the Rel. Pronoun within Rel. Clause. (a) By supplementing Rel. Pron. by a Pers. Pron. attached as Suff. to Noun concerned	531
	Or by prefixing necessary Prep. to Suff. Pron.	532
	(b) By prefixing Prepositions and Signs of Case to the Rel. Pron. itself	532
	(c) By longer Prepositions placed after the Rel. Pron. which they govern.	533
	3. Relative Construction as Periphrastic Substitute for Participles and Adjectives	534
	4. Position of Words in a Relative Clause	536

(c) *Conjunctive Relative Clauses.*

§ 203.	1. Subject or Object expressed by an entire Clause:—	
	(a) Declarative Clause introduced by ዘ	536
	(b) Supplementary Object-Clause introduced by ከመ , እከመ &c.	537
	(α) After Verbs of <i>Perceiving, Recognising</i> &c.	537
	(β) " " " <i>Saying, Declaring</i> &c.	538
	(γ) " " " <i>Fearing and Guarding against</i>	539
	(δ) " " " <i>Beginning and Leaving off</i>	539
	(ε) " " " <i>Ability, Understanding</i> &c.	540
	2. Remote Object—Design, Consequence, Cause &c.—expressed by an entire Clause:—	540
	(a) Final Clauses	540
	(b) Consecutive Clauses.	541
	(c) Causal Clauses.	542
§ 204.	3. Comparative Clauses.	542
	4. Temporal Clauses	544

3. RECIPROCAL SENTENCES AND WORDS.

(a) Conditional Sentences.

	Page
§ 205. General Description. Particles and Tenses employed in Protasis and Apodosis	546
1. In Simple Conditional Sentences	548
2. In Unreal Conditional Sentences	551

(b) Correlated Clauses and Words.

§ 206. Various Formulae of Correlation	554
--	-----

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	556
-------------------------------------	-----

INDEX OF PASSAGES	559
-----------------------------	-----



TABLES.

	Table
Characters of the Ethiopic Alphabet	I
The Formation of Verbs	II—V
The Formation of Pronouns	VI
The Attachment of Verbal Suffixes	VII
The Gender- and Number-Formation of Nominal Stems	VIII—IX



INTRODUCTION.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE.

§ 1. The beginnings of the great Abyssinian kingdom stretch back to pretty early times, which cannot now be more exactly determined. It emerged into the light of history immediately upon its conversion to Christianity in the third century, and with increasing clearness on to the seventh; and from that time forward, all through the Middle Ages and up to the commencement of the seventeenth century, it occupied an important position in the midst of the bordering populations of Africa and Arabia. In that kingdom once flourished the language commonly called *Ethiopic*, and it is to the description of that language that the present work is devoted. Originally one only of the manifold dialects into which the Arabic-African branch of the Semitic tongue split up, though one of the noblest among them, it gained, through the tribe by which it was spoken, the position of being the leading speech in the kingdom, starting as it did from their country of Tigrē and its chief town Axum, and keeping pace with the development of the kingdom, while the modes of speech native to other tribes in the land lived on alongside of it merely as vulgar dialects. Farther, by means of the numerous writings, chiefly of Christian contents, which were speedily composed in it, it became bound up in the most intimate manner with the life of the Church and the whole culture of the people. In this position it maintained itself, as long as the centre of gravity of the kingdom remained in Tigrē and Axum. It is true that when the South-Western provinces grew into importance, and the seat of government was transferred to the district south of Takazzē toward Lake Šānā, another dialect,

Sketch of
the History
of the Lan-
guage.

the Amharic, came into fashion as the ordinary speech of the court and of the officials of the country; but Ethiopic even then continued to retain its full importance as the literary language, in which all books and even official documents were written; and the three centuries of this period may be regarded indeed as the age of the second bloom of the Ethiopic speech. It was only when the Galla tribes pressed into the country after the close of the sixteenth century, and thus shook and loosened the entire kingdom, that the language received its deathblow. The kingdom was broken up; the several parts were dis severed from the whole; civilisation yielded to a rapid recrudescence of barbarism; Christianity was pressed hard and partly supplanted by Islam, and in itself it degenerated into the merest caricature of a Christian faith. Along with the power, culture and literature of these lands the venerable speech died out also. To be sure it has remained the sacred language and the ecclesiastical language up to the present day; and, as late even as last century, books, especially the annals of the country, were still composed in it; but it was understood by the educated priests only and perhaps by a few of the nobles, and even such men preferred to write in Amharic. Now-a-days even among the priests, only a few probably are to be found who possess some scanty acquaintance with the Ethiopic tongue⁽¹⁾.

The dialects of the several tribes and provinces,—most of them being no doubt of Semitic origin, but containing a strong admixture of elements from the adjoining African tongues—are now flourishing there in motley variety and rank luxuriance. The most widely extended among them is the Amharic⁽²⁾, which in

(1) For Ethiopic Bibliography cf.: G. FUMAGALLI, '*Bibliografia Etiopica. Catalogo descrittivo e ragionato degli scritti pubblicati dalla invenzione della stampa fino a tutto il 1891 intorno alla Etiopia e regioni limitrofe*', Milano 1893; [and L. GOLDSCHMIDT, '*Biblioteca Aethiopica, vollstaendiges verzeichniss und ausfuehrliche beschreibung saemmtlicher Aethiopischer druckwerke*', Leipzig 1893, as well as the "Litteratura Aethiopica" in PRAETORIUS' '*Aethiopische Grammatik*', Berlin 1886, p. 21 sqq.; and C. CONTI ROSSINI's '*Note per la storia letteraria abissina*': *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Vol. VIII (Roma 1900), p. 197 sqq.].

(2) Europeans have been made better acquainted with this language through ISENBERG'S '*Dictionary of the Amharic Language*', London 1841, and '*Grammar of the Amharic Language*', London 1842. [V. now also PRAETORIUS, '*Die Amharische Sprache*', Halle 1879; GUIDI, '*Grammatica elementare della*

manifold forms is spoken, or at least understood, in Shoa and in all the district lying between Takazzē and Abāwī. On the other hand the language spoken in the Tigrē country has retained the nearest resemblance to Ethiopic⁽¹⁾.

The name, *Ethiopic Language*, which the old national speech Its Name. of Abyssinia commonly bears among us now, is derived from the classical denomination given to the inhabitants of these regions, and has been taken over from the Greek by the Abyssinians themselves. Accordingly they called their kingdom ኢትዮጵያ, and the national tongue ልሳነ : ኢትዮጵያ. The original native appellation for the people, however, and farther for their speech, is ግዕዝ, literally “roaming”, then as a national designation, in the sense of “the Roamers”, “the Free”; and thus comes ልሳነ : ግዕዝ “the tongue of the Free”⁽²⁾.

§ 2. In origin and essence Ethiopic is a pure Semitic speech, Origin and Character. transplanted by people who migrated from Yemen to Abyssinia. In its sounds and laws of sounds, in its roots, inflectional expedients and word-forms, in all that is reckoned the structure and essence of a language, it bears throughout a genuine and uncorrupted Semitic stamp⁽³⁾. All its roots may be pointed out as recurring in the other Semitic languages, especially in Arabic, although often diverging greatly in form, or preserved merely in a fragmentary condition. From the indigenous languages of these African regions only a very few names of plants and animals have been taken; while the names of the months,—which Ludolf imagined to have come from the same stock,—appear to be of decidedly Semitic origin. True, the Ge'ez people learned a few stray things, about matters so external as writing, from the Greeks, with whom the Abyssinians had dealings in times even before Christ, and with whom they continued in uninterrupted intercourse

lingua Amariña’, Roma 1889; D’ABBADIE, ‘*Dictionnaire de la langue Amariña*’, Paris 1881 and GUIDI, ‘*Vocabolario amarico-italiano*’, Roma 1901.]

(1) [Cf. E. LITTMANN, ‘*Die Pronomina im Tigre*’: *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie* XII, pp. 188sqq.; 291sqq.; ‘*Das Verbum der Tigrsprache*’, *ibid.* XIII, p. 133sqq., XIV, p. 1sqq.; and NÖLDEKE, ‘*Die semitischen Sprachen*’, 2nd ed. Leipzig 1899, p. 71sq.]

(2) V. LUDOLFI ‘*Historia Aethiopica*’, lib. I, cap. 1, 4, & cap. 15, 3.

(3) PRAETORIUS tries to point out Hamitic elements in the Ethiopic Lexicon: ZDMG XLIII, p. 317sqq.

up to the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt. From the Greeks also they borrowed several names and several terms of art, which passed into the flesh and blood of the language. In a similar way a number of pure Aramaic and Arabic words were adopted into it through intercourse with the Arabs, Jews and Aramaeans. But the entire sum of these contributions does not exceed the ordinary proportion of borrowed words which prevails in other languages maintained otherwise in purity. Ethiopic, from its very start, was protected against such a considerable infusion of foreign elements as we see in Syriac, by the superior richness of its vocabulary, and by the long-continued activity of the faculty of formation possessed by the language, which enabled it to produce equivalent Ethiopic expressions for notions of every kind, however abstract they might be. On the other hand the language kept itself at the same time, as regarded its structure, quite free from Greek influences. Even its Syntax, which in its flexibility, variety and marvellous faculty for co-ordinating and subordinating long phrases in one whole, so remarkably resembles Greek syntax, proves on closer investigation to be founded merely upon a very rich development, and skilful handling, of original Semitic grammatical expedients and formative tendencies. It must, of course, be granted that this peculiar leaning in the Ethiopic language to grandiose periods and bold arrangements of words was confirmed by the familiarity of Abyssinian authors with Greek⁽¹⁾ works, and was thereby stimulated to a more manifold development of its several tendencies.

§ 3. Of Semitic languages Arabic is the one with which Ethiopic has the most numerous and close affinities⁽²⁾. Nothing else could have been expected, when regard is had to the derivation of the Abyssinian Semites from Southern Arabia, and to the active intercourse which they long maintained with it. This relationship is at once and clearly betrayed by marks like the following:—in the alphabetical system—the division of the old Semitic

Close Affinities with Arabic:—Resemblances and Differences.

(1) V., however, PRAETORIUS, '*Grammatik der Tigrīnasprache*', Halle 1871, p. 2, *Rem.*

(2) V., on the other hand, HAUPT, '*J. Am. Or. Soc.*', Vol. XIII, p. CCLII *sqq.*, according to whose opinion Ethiopic, of all the Semitic languages, stands nearest to Assyrian.

ṇ and ṣ each into two separate sounds; in the structure of words and inflections—the frequent endings in a short vowel, the greater multiplicity of conjugational forms in the Verb, and the fuller development of Quadriliteral and Multiliteral roots,—the Inner Plural or Collective formation in the Noun, the regular distinguishing of the Accusative, as also of the Indicative and Subjunctive in the Imperfect, the capability of attaching two Pronominal suffixes to one verb, and a host of other scattered and subordinate phenomena; in the vocabulary—an unmistakeable array of roots which are elsewhere developed or preserved in Arabic only, and not in the more northerly Semitic languages.

And yet Ethiopic is far from being a mere dialect of Arabic, especially if we understand by that the ordinary Literary or Middle Arabic. In fact the vocabularies of the two present a very peculiar contrast, in respect that Ethiopic usually employs altogether different words and roots from Arabic, for the expression of precisely those notions and objects which are most frequently met with in common life⁽¹⁾, while *vice versâ* the words and roots, usual in Arabic in such cases, are found in Ethiopic in scattered traces only. Then the most of the Prepositions and Conjunctions are quite different in the two, with the exception of a few which are common to all the Semitic tongues. In the structure of its syllables Ethiopic has not developed the richness in Vowels which characterises Arabic, or else it has lost it again: in this respect it comes nearer to Hebrew. As regards its roots, it has, in opposition to all the other Semitic languages, very strongly-marked phonetic changes and transpositions, and it occupies quite a peculiar and unique position in the Semitic family through the evolution of the *u*-containing Gutturals and Palatals. Ethiopic never attained to the copious wealth of Forms possessed by Arabic, although it is certain that it had a greater number of forms in earlier times. In particular, Diminutives and Augmen-

(1) Compare the words for:—*God, Man* (Homo), *Man, Woman, Body, Sight, Earth, Land, Town, King, Animal, Sun, Moon, Day, Mountain, Valley, good, bad, big, little, much, rich, poor, remaining*; farther for:—*to go, to reach, to turn back, to follow, to send, to forsake, to fall, to sit down, to dwell, to flee, to carry, to will, to call, to command, to write, to seek, to finish, to find, to repeat, to conquer, to say, to tell, to act, to rejoice, to love, to burn, to build &c.*

tatives are altogether wanting, as well as the Emphatic state⁽¹⁾. It farther took a different course from Arabic in the formation of the Imperfect, as well as in Case-formation—with the exception of the Accusative. In the sensitiveness of its vowels to the utterance of a guttural⁽²⁾ it ranges itself with Hebrew rather than with Arabic. It has gone farther than the rest of the Semitic languages in evolving strong roots out of weak ones; and it has developed the formation of the Conjugations in certain directions with more consistency than Arabic itself. And in various other things⁽³⁾ it has kept to a more antique stage than the rest of the Semitic tongues. Ethiopic has no Article, but it has preserved an originality and a fulness in the department of the Pronouns, unmatched by its sister languages. Then it has a host of pronominal particles, of which not a trace is now left in Arabic, while in the perfecting of Enclitics it has followed out an original Semitic bent with a thoroughness which is found nowhere else. In framing Sentences and Periods it has brought into many-sided use expedients and devices, which have long been given up in Arabic, but are still hinted at in Hebrew as belonging to the ancient Semitic speech. As regards its treatment of the Gender of Nouns, it seems to transfer us quite to the original condition of the language, when the settlement of Gender was still in process, and all as yet was fluctuating; nor has it gained any fixity on this point, even in its latest stages. And finally, we come upon many expressions in the vocabulary, which have disappeared from Arabic, at least in the meaning concerned, although they belonged to the original Semitic common-stock⁽⁴⁾.

(¹) According to D. H. MÜLLER, '*Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien*', Vienna 1894, p. 72 = '*Denkschriften d. k. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Classe*' XLIII, III—these conditions are to be explained by the influence of the Hamitic tongues upon Ethiopic.

(²) Cf. KÖNIG, '*Neue Studien über Schrift, Aussprache und allgemeine Formenlehre des Aethiopischen*', Leipzig 1877, p. 137.

(³) KÖNIG classes along with these (*ibid.* p. 87 sq.) the Imperfect-form ይነግር, the endings ከ, ከ, ከ- in the Verb, and the Feminine formation of Adjectives like ሐዲስ, ሐዳስ; v. *infra* §§ 92, 129, 135.

(⁴) አሳት (𐩨𐩣), ዕዕ (𐩠𐩢), አብን (𐩨𐩣), ወርኅ (𐩨።), (تأريخ), ምት (𐩨።), ረሲዕ (𐩨።), ምጥቀት (𐩨።), ትማልም (𐩨።), መንሱት (𐩨።).

All this leads to the conclusion that Ethiopic, after its separation from the Northern Semitic, pursued a common course with Arabic for some time longer, but parted company with it at a pretty early date and at a time in fact when Arabic had not yet attained to its present luxuriance in forms, nor yet to its strictly regular, inflexible, stiff monotony. Ethiopic in this way saved a good deal of the old Semitic, which Arabic suffered to decay, and it also developed a portion of it in a wholly different manner from Arabic. The most of its force, however, subsequent to its severance from the rest of the Semitic languages, was applied to the elaboration of a multiplicity in the methods of conjoining and arranging words in a sentence,—answering to the multiplicity existing in the possible modes of thought and discourse,—and to the development of the pronominal section of the roots which specially conveys the more subtle relations and conditions of thought.

§ 4. In contrast, however, with the antique character of Ethiopic—in various respects truly remarkable,—stand a large number of decidedly later modes of formation and expression, in which we see it coinciding with languages that have reached an advanced stage of development, like Aramaic. In this reference we attach no particular importance to the softening of the pronunciation of one or two Semitic sounds, such as Gutturals and Sibilants, inasmuch as that process appears to have predominated only in the course of the Middle Ages, and is a phenomenon illustrated contemporaneously in other Semitic dialects, though it has gone farthest in Amharic. But our statement is borne out by the fact that Ethiopic has given up, or replaced by external formations, many old forms and inner formations, which once it must have had, as well as by the fact that, alongside of the old forms and formations which it retains, it has admitted several new and more external ones, mainly with the view of attaining thereby to a greater freedom in the structure of its periods. It has entirely given up the Dual both in Verb

Develop-
ment of the
Language.

(ḥṣḥ), ወግር (ገገ), እስኪት (ገሃጽ), መግ (ጸጸ), ሰከበ (ሃሃ); ገደለ (ገገ), ገሥአ (ሰሰ), ክህለ (ክህ), ወፅአ (ሰሰ), አልመደ (ሰሰ), ሰፈረ (ሰሰ), ነገፈ (ገገ), ወረወ (ገገ), አውሰበ (ሰሰ), ጠቐሰ (ገገ), ፈረደ (ገገ), ጠየቀ (ገገ), (ሰሰ), and several others.

and Noun, just like Aramaic. Towards the formation of Nouns and Inner Plurals it has manifestly at one time possessed a greater number of forms, but owing to a certain economy, abundantly noticeable too in other matters, it has put many of them aside as being unnecessary. Even in the Verb this frugality is shown, so that only a few verbs make use of more than four Conjugations (Stems), while the most of them do not use even so many. A special Passive voice is no longer met with; and its place is supplied by the Reflexive, just as in Syriac. The Active Participle, in the simple Conjugation (Stem) at least, has almost disappeared: in the derived conjugations it is more frequently formed to be sure, but still not regularly, and it is very often lengthened by an external Adjective-ending. Upon the whole the place of the Participle is taken either by Conjunctive Periphrasis or by some other grammatical device. The simple Adjective-formation has greatly decayed. On the other hand the formation of words by external addition through prefixes and suffixes, and the formation of derived Substantives and Adjectives, have gained ground. Ethiopic, as we know it, has the capacity of forming Adjectives from all possible Nouns by means of added terminations, of deriving many Abstracts by means of endings, and of advancing Collectives to be Nouns of bulk by means of external plural-endings. Even from Nouns that had been formed by means of external increase, it derives new Verbs, still preserving the additions found in the Nominal formation, and it has allowed the external formation strongly to affect the Infinitive also. To express the Genitive relation it has developed, alongside of the old Construct state, the indication given by an external Genitive sign, just like Aramaic. The roundabout expression of the Genitive and Accusative relations by means of a pronoun appended to the governing word, followed by a preposition having reference thereto,—is quite as often met with in Ethiopic as in Syriac, and at the same time it serves in most cases to compensate for the Article. The use of a pronoun affixed to the verb, with a dative signification, has become very common. Then along with the early Semitic form and method of conjoining words in the sentence, ample occupation has been found for Prepositions and Conjunctions in this endeavour. And,—to come back once more to the sounds of the language,—the disappearance of the short *i* and *u*, and the dissolving of all

the short vowels, except *ă*, into the most undefined and characterless of all the vowels, viz. the short *ě*, constitute a phenomenon not indeed original, but still very ancient, in the Ethiopic speech.

Consequently much that is old and much that is new lie here together, sometimes strangely mingled: Things which in other languages are allotted to different stages of growth or to different dialects are met with in Ethiopic side by side. We may therefore conclude that Ethiopic, as it presents itself to us in its literature, has a long period of development behind it, and that the people who once spoke it attained in early times to a high degree of culture. Moreover the people who produced such an admirable and majestic style of sentence with the implements of Semitic speech must have been endowed with great intellectual genius and logical gifts.

§ 5. It would be a highly desirable advantage for us of course, to be better acquainted with the language during the time when it was thus coming into being, and to be able to follow it up throughout its various stages of development. But just as in most other languages, so also in this, such an advantage is denied us. The most ancient of the larger monuments of Ethiopic which we have, viz. the two long Axumite inscriptions, made known by E. RÜPPELL⁽¹⁾—barely reach back to the end of the 5th century of our era. Certainly other shorter inscriptions from Axum and other places exist, and have been to some extent noticed already in books of travel⁽²⁾, being of still older date than those first-mentioned,—to judge from the form of their letters: they are, however, both too short and too inaccurately copied to enable us to deduce much from them. Lastly, the Minao-Sabaic monuments, which in quite recent times were discovered in great quantities, exhibit to us a language that, in spite of the agreement in alphabetical character, diverges greatly from Ethiopic, and furnish us

Changes in
its Pho-
netic Sys-
tem and
Vocabu-
lary.

(1) In the Supplement to his '*Travels*' printed 1838—40; v. notice of the work in ZDMG VII, p. 338 *sqq.* [V. also D. H. MÜLLER, '*Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien*'.]

(2) V. the *Travels* of SALT AND LORD VALENTIA: One of the Inscriptions mentioned there has been republished in ISENBERG'S '*Dictionary of the Amh. Lang.*', p. 209. [V. also C. CONTI ROSSINI, '*L'iscrizione dell' obelisco presso Matarà: Rendiconti della R. Accad. dei Lincei* Vol. V (Roma 1896) p. 250 *sqq.*]

with a proof that the last-named language parted company in very early times with its sister languages of Southern Arabia. Thus it comes that we have not the means of acquainting ourselves with the condition of the Abyssinian national speech in times anterior to the conversion of the country to the Christian faith. And it is only from stray internal evidence, as for instance from the occasional appearance still, with the Noun, of the Suffix Pronoun of the 1st Pers. Sing. *i*, instead of a later *(e)ya*,—from the retention of *ě* (ḥ) in a few Interrogative Particles, or the Negative *ěn* (ḥ),—and such other things,—that we are able to conclude that Ethiopic in its earliest period of development had a much closer affinity with Hebrew than appears in the later form of the language. For this very reason we need not wonder that the deciphering of the Minao-Sabaic inscriptions yielded many remarkable analogies between that dialect and Hebrew.

Altogether Ethiopic appears at the beginning of its last thousand years of existence as already a full-grown language, which experienced only a few alterations as time went on. The principal changes which it underwent during that period concern on the one hand its phonetic system, particularly in the pronunciation of its vowels, and on the other its vocabulary, and the continuance in use, or the falling out of use, exhibited by one or two Word-forms. In the first reference we hold that not earlier than during that period can the softening of the pronunciation of many Consonants have become so marked and so general,—that many peculiarities in the relation of Gutturals to Vowels are of comparatively late origin,—and that many words and forms have exchanged a fuller and more original Vowel-pronunciation for one more faint and faded. We cannot, it is true, obtain proof for what has been advanced, from a comparison of the Inscriptions with the later literary language, because these inscriptions have themselves only defective and occasionally fluctuating vowel-signs⁽¹⁾ (§ 12 *sq.*); but the most ancient Manuscripts which we possess, dating from the 13th and 14th centuries onwards, place in our hands evidence of every kind to support those propositions; and we may infer that if we ever came upon Manuscripts belonging

(1) [This view, however, is not confirmed by the accurate copies which we now possess: The Axumite Inscriptions are fully vocalised.]

to any of the six or seven earlier centuries, such evidence would flow in upon us still more copiously. The details of these questions will be explained farther on, in the Grammar itself.

As regards the other point, all truly careful investigation of old Texts, up to the oldest, and their various readings, proves that many forms and words, and meanings of single words, though in use in earlier days, fell into disuse as time went on, and were replaced by new ones,—also and specially, that Arabic words, which were rarely employed in the language of literature, but were quite intelligible to the people, streamed in again more abundantly in the days of lively intercourse with Arabic-speaking populations and tribes, or through the medium of books translated from Arabic⁽¹⁾.

§ 6. The language was cultivated for literary purposes mainly in the service of religion and of the Church. The large majority of the extant writings are of ecclesiastical character. These had their basis in the versions of the Books of the Old and New Testaments, in the widest acceptance of the word, which versions were followed forthwith by the translation, or even the independent elaboration, of a series of theological and liturgical works. Beyond question all native authors, in their methods of thought and statement, were dependent more or less on Scripture models. After the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, and following the cultivation of an Arabic Christian literature, it was in their turn these Arabic models by which Ethiopic authors let themselves be swayed. The language at that time found varied application in setting forth historical, legal, chronological and mathematical material. Many original works of the most diverse kinds were produced in the latest period of prosperity enjoyed

Ethiopic
Literature.
Modern In-
vestiga-
tions.

(¹) In neither of these points referred to has much been done hitherto for the investigation of Ethiopic. LUDOLF paid no attention whatever to such historical examination of the language, and represented many things which are ancient and divergent as being mere copyists' errors. So too THOMAS PELL PLATT, in the edition of the N. T. which he prepared for the English Bible Society (London 1830) [reprinted at Leipzig 1899], disregarded this point of view. As for myself I have devoted special attention to this matter in my editions of Texts, as the Apparatus Criticus found in them will show, but I must express the wish that others who edit Texts would do the same thing.

by the speech and the nation, namely from 1300 to 1600 A. D., among which incontestably the most important are the great native Chronicles. Mohammedan Magic-books also, and writings on Astrology and Medicine, gained entrance among the people about the time when barbarism and darkness crept over them. Poetry was always cherished by the Ethiopians with special predilection, but almost exclusively in the service of religion, so far as we yet know. The great Service Hymn-books of the seventh and following centuries are fine poetical productions, but constructed very decidedly on the model of the Psalms. Later on, Sacred Poetry degenerates into an innumerable quantity of *Encomia* of Saints—men and women,—and proportionately sinks in intrinsic value. Unfortunately this department of Ethiopic literature has hitherto been very little enquired into; yet this much we can even now see,—that an artistic Metric had never been developed in it; the farthest that was reached in the evolution of orderly form was the articulating of verse in symmetrical strophes, accompanied with rhyme,—for the matter of that often enough very imperfect.

The Ethiopic language has never had native grammarians, as far as yet known; and this circumstance sufficiently explains why one or two phenomena in it,—like, for instance, the Conjugational-formation (Stem) and Imperfect-formation of several derived Conjugations (Stems), or the treatment of the Gender of Nouns—, continued to the last so fluctuating and irregular.

Attempts at Ethiopic-Amharic Dictionaries were made in abundance, it is true, about the time the speech was dying out, but they are all very crude, and do not occupy themselves with the grammatical part of the language.

In Europe people began to interest themselves in Ethiopic, in the 16th century. Besides the Abyssinian TESFA-ZION and his associates, who published the N. T. at Rome in 1548,—and to some extent even before him,—it was JOHN POTKEN of Cologne, MARIANUS VICTORIUS of Reate, JO. SCALIGER, TH. PETRÆUS and J. G. NISSELIUS, JAC. WEMMERS at ANTWERP, and lastly EDMUND CASTELL, who rendered meritorious services to Ethiopic in various degrees, partly by printing some of the shorter Texts, and partly by grammatical and lexical endeavours⁽¹⁾. A more comprehensive

(1) Cf. also: *Chaldaee seu Aethiopicae linguae Institutiones: nunquam*

and exact acquaintance with the tongue we owe first, however, to the immortal services of JOB LUDOLF⁽¹⁾, who published the *first* edition of his '*Grammatica Aethiopica*', 4^{to}, in 1661, and the *second* edition, folio, in 1702, the latter being still useful. A second and indispensable help was added in his '*Lexicon Aethiopico-Latinum*', the second edition of which, folio, was printed at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in 1699. Inasmuch as LUDOLF in his labours had the advantage of being tutored by a born Ethiopian,—GREGORY,—at a time when Ethiopic was still tolerably well understood in Abyssinia, we must take his facts as the groundwork for all which relates to Pronunciation. It deserves to be kept in view, however, that the facts referred to, justify conclusions merely for the pronunciation of Ethiopic common in later times, and are not to be relied upon throughout. In every other point the labours of LUDOLF have long outlived their sufficiency. Judged from the present position of philology they can no longer be regarded as satisfactory in any single part. During the 150 years that have elapsed since LUDOLF's day, the furtherance of our knowledge of Ethiopic has been almost wholly neglected both in Germany and in the rest of Europe. At the most a few printed texts have been revised or simply re-issued, and an occasional reference to Ethiopic has been made here and there in Hebrew Grammars and Dictionaries⁽²⁾. In 1825 H. HUPFELD gave⁽³⁾ a certain impulse

antea a Latinis visae, opus utile ac eruditum. Item,—Omnium Aethiopiae regum qui ab inundato terrarum orbe usque ad nostra tempora imperarunt Libellus: hactenus tam Graecis quam Latinis ignoratus, nuper ex Aethiopica translatus lingua. And at the end: '*Impressit omnia quae in hoc libro continentur, ex primatum licentia VALERIUS DORICUS BRIXIEN, opera ANGELI DE OLDRADIS. Romae. Anno natali Christi M.D.L.II. 4^o*'. [For the first printed text of the Psalms (in 1513), and of the N. T. v. also GUIDI, '*La prima stampa del Nuovo Testamento in Etiopico fatta in Roma nel 1548—1549*', in Vol. IX of the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia patria*, Rome 1886.]

⁽¹⁾ [Cf. J. FLEMMING, '*Hiob Ludolf: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der orientalischen Philologie*' in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, Vol. I, 1890, p. 537 sqq., and Vol. II, 1894, p. 63 sqq.]

⁽²⁾ The '*Grammatica Aethiopica conscripta*' a JO. PHIL. HARTMANNO, Frankfort a. M. 1707, 4^{to} is a poor epitome of LUDOLF's work; nor has learning been advanced by J. G. HASSE's '*Handbuch der arabischen und äthiopischen Sprache*', Jena 1793.

⁽³⁾ In a paper written in early youth '*Exercitationes Aethiopicae*'

to the resumption of grammatical labours in the field of our language, without, however, this start having been followed up either by himself or others. Some valuable contributions to Ethiopic phonology have been furnished by H. TUCH⁽¹⁾; and many excellent hints on isolated phenomena in the Ethiopic language are found in the latest edition of EWALD's '*Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*'⁽²⁾.

Lips. 1825, 4^o. The chief merit of this paper lies in pointing out the true distinction between the first and the second Conjugations (Stems) of the Verb, which LUDOLF had entirely mistaken. As to what HUPFELD has advanced about the Ethiopic pronouns in his treatise '*Semitische Demonstrativbildung*' in the 2nd vol. of the *Zeitschr. f. d. K. d. Morg.*, it appears to me in many respects untenable. DRECHSLER's work '*De Aethiopicæ linguæ conjugationibus*', Lipsiae 1825, has complicated rather than amended LUDOLF's theory of Stem-formation: the sole value it possesses belongs to its collection of supporting-passages for a series of verbal forms.

(¹) I. '*Commentatio de Aethiopicæ linguæ sonorum proprietatibus quibusdam*', Lips. 1854; II. '*De Aethiopicæ linguæ sonorum sibilantium natura et usu*', Lips. 1854.

(²) [V. now, particularly A. DILLMANN's '*Lexicon linguæ Aethiopicæ cum indice Latino*', Lips. 1865, as well as F. PRAETORIUS' '*Aethiopische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Litteratur, Chrestomathie und Glossar*' = '*Porta linguarum Orientalium*'.—inchoavit J. H. PETERMANN, continuavit HERM. L. STRACK,—Pars VII, Leipzig 1886.]

PART FIRST.

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY.

As the Ethiopic alphabetic Character differs completely in form and in kind from that of the other known Semitic tongues, the subject itself invites us to begin with a description of that Character.

I. ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 7. The Ethiopic Character has been fashioned, by a series of more or less important alterations, from the Minao-Sabaic character, or one resembling it, and together they represent the Southern branch of the alphabetical systems, into which the original Semitic alphabet was very early divided. The opinion of earlier scholars, that the Ethiopic Character was of Greek origin⁽¹⁾, must now be regarded as completely set aside. The characters of the Abyssinian Inscriptions are either identical with the Minao-Sabaic, or so like them that there can be no manner of doubt about their derivation⁽²⁾. The changes which the Minao-Sabaic

Minao-Sabaic
Origin of
the Alpha-
betic Cha-
racters.

⁽¹⁾ V. on this point HUPFELD, *Exercitationes Aeth.* p. 1–4 and KOPP, *‘Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit’*. LUDOLF too inclined to this view, but still he thought that the ‘inventor’ had had an eye also on the Samaritan alphabet, therein showing a correct apprehension of the Semitic origin of this Character (*Hist.* IV, 1. *Comment.* p. 60, 555).

⁽²⁾ As to the literature, cf. E. KÖNIG, *‘Neue Studien über Schrift, Aussprache, und allgemeine Formenlehre des Aethiopischen, aus den Quellen geschöpft, comparativ und physiologisch erläutert’*. Leipzig 1877 [in what follows, quoted as “KÖNIG”]. Farther, SCHLOTTMANN in RIEHM’s HWB p. 1420sq.; DERENBOURG, *‘Journ. as.’* VII, 19, p. 375sq.; FRDR. MÜLLER, *‘Ueber den Ursprung der himjarisch-äthiopischen Schrift’*, Vienna 1869 [and D. H. MÜLLER,

form of writing has undergone in Abyssinia are manifold, and will be farther described by-and-by; but they are not so marked as to prevent us from recognising without difficulty the ancient Minao-Sabaic characters in the ordinary Ethiopic ones, independently even of the intervention of the Ethiopic Inscriptions (*cf.* Table I). The character, like the speech itself, and even more decidedly, has kept to a very antique stage. Both in print, and as a rule in Manuscripts, it is inscribed with large, firmly impressed strokes; and the older the manuscripts, the more pronounced is this feature.

Number of
the Conso-
nants.

§ 8. I. Like all the other Semitic forms of writing, the Ethiopic is originally consonantal. The number and the order of these consonants are not the same, however, in this language as in the others. Farther, the names given them are here and there peculiar.

(1) In *Number* the Ethiopic Consonants are *six-and-twenty*,—four more than in the Northern Semitic tongues. Two of these four are accounted for by dividing, in two cases, a sound that once was single into two modes of pronunciation. The strong Guttural **ḥ** was divided, just as among the Arabs, into the two sounds **ḥ** (ح), and **ḥ̣** (خ); and in the same way the sibilant **ṣ** was divided into **ṣ** (ص) and **ṣ̣** (ض). Other divisions, peculiar to the Arabs, of sounds originally one into two, viz. **ḥ** into **ḥ** and **ḥ̣**, **ṣ** into **ṣ** and **ṣ̣**, and **ṣ̣** into **ṣ̣** and **ṣ̣̣**, are unknown to the Ethiopians, though perhaps the Minao-Sabaeans had them. On the other hand the Abyssinians possess two additional sounds, which were not admitted into Arabic, viz,—a hard, peculiarly-formed Labial (§ 28) **ḥ** = *p*; and one that answers more to the usual *p*,—that is **ṣ̣̣**, mostly employed in foreign words. Besides these 26 characters, Amharic letters appear, it is true, in Ethiopic books, when foreign words

'*Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien*', p. 69; M. LIDZBARSKI, '*Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*' I, p. 109sq., II, p. 23sq.; and PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVIII (1904), p. 715sq.]. On the earlier theory of the connection of the Ethiopic alphabet with the *Indian*, cf. SALT, '*Voyage to Abyssinia*' (1814), p. 415; LEPSIUS, '*Zwei sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen*' (1836), p. 76 sq. and DEEKE, ZDMG XXXI, p. 598; on the opposite side, DOWSON, '*J. Roy. As. Soc.*' XIII (1881), pt. 1.—Completely astray is the account given in J. BIRD'S '*Sur l'origine de l'alphabet Himiarite et de l'alphabet Éthiopien*' in '*Nouvelles annales des voyages*', Paris 1845, Vol. II, p. 196sq.

or native proper names from the various Abyssinian dialects have to be written with greater exactness, but these do not concern us here⁽¹⁾.

§ 9. (2) The *Names* of these alphabetical characters and sounds are essentially the same as among the other Semites, and have manifestly been taken over along with the alphabet⁽²⁾. Some of them have been so far altered as to conform to the Ethiopic expression or word in use, without the original sense of the Name being affected; a few others remain only in a corrupt form and without any clear meaning. In particular, *Alf*, *Bēt*, *Geml*, *Kāf*, *‘Ain* directly coincide with the old names: *Qāf* is to be understood for *Qōf*, according to § 18; *Tait* and *Sadai* rest upon the resolution of the diphthong *ē* into *ai*: *Re’es* is the ordinary Ethiopic word for “head”, *Māi*, for “water”: the old name *Yod* was not available, because the Ethiopic word for “hand” was rather **አደ**, and it was accordingly replaced suitably by *Yaman* “right hand”: for a like reason *Nun* “fish”, which word is not in use in Ethiopic, has been exchanged for a word of like meaning *Nahās* “serpent”; in this way in the last two cases the starting sounds *y* and *n* have been properly preserved. But when the Ethiopians exchanged *Pē* “mouth” for *Af* which is their word for “mouth”, then the general rule,—according to which the commencing sound in the name must be the same as the sound of the character,—was set at nought, and a clear proof was given at the same time that the Ethiopic name is not the original one. For *Waw* and *Taw* the Ethiopians, in accordance with § 38, say *Wave*, *Tawe*. For *Hēt* they prefer to use an Arabic word, but of the same meaning, *Haut* (حَوط), and for its sister-sound they have created a new name of like meaning, *Harm* (حَرَم) “hedge”⁽³⁾. On the other hand *Zai*,

Names of
the Conso-
nants.

(1) [For the benefit of students, however, these letters have been added on Table I. TR.]

(2) On the names of the Ethiopic Consonants among the Abyssinians of to-day, consisting each of an Ethiopic word, which starts with the sound designated, e. g. **ኣ ኣሥኣ**, **ገ ገብረ**, **ፀ ፀሐይ** cf. PRAETORIUS, ‘*Amhar. Spr.*’ § 1b and ZDMG XLI, p. 687. [Cf. farther, on the names of the Ethiopic Letters, NÖLDEKE, ‘*Die semitischen Buchstabennamen*’ in ‘*Beitr. z. Semit. Sprachwissenschaft*’, Strassburg 1904, p. 131 sqq. TR.]

(3) [NÖLDEKE (‘*Beitr. z. semit. Sprachw.*’ p. 133) rejects this explanation

Dent (v. GESENIUS, 'Thes.' p. 727, and *infra* § 32) and still more strongly *Lawe*, properly *Law*,—seem to have been corrupted from *Zain*⁽¹⁾, *Dalt* and *Lamed* respectively: These three names have no longer any meaning in Ethiopic. *Hōi* is just as obscure a name as *Hē*, with which it appears to be identical. The most obscure names, however, continue to be *Šaut* and *Sāt* instead of *Shin* and *Samech*: the most probable explanation is that they are imitations of the outward form of the names *Ḥaut* and *Bēt*, to the characters of which their own present a resemblance. *Šappā*⁽²⁾ (originally *Dappā*) I compare with ضَبَّة "a bolt", which is quite appropriate to the ancient form of the character. *Paṭ* is a name formed in imitation of *Ṭaiṭ*, next to which it stands in the Alphabet; and *Pa* is the Greek *Pi*: Moreover, the name of the last-mentioned character was once given with a slight sibilation,—*Psa*.

Order of the
Ethiopic
Alphabet.

§ 10. (3) Of more importance, however, than its divergence from the Northern-Semitic Alphabet in the Names of the Consonants, is the divergence of the Ethiopic alphabet in the *Order* in which they stand. The Hebrew order of the characters is, as we know, very ancient; but we do not know how ancient the Ethiopic order may be, nor even whether the Minao-Sabaeans had the same order. We are not justified in contending right off that the Hebrew order is the original, and the Ethiopic the derived one. It may, on the other hand, with some reason be thought that during the times which followed the invention and spread of the Alphabet different orders of the letters came into vogue, being definitely arranged in different ways in different regions. And in fact, on closer investigation of the order of the Ethiopic Alphabet, one peculiarity in it appears to yield the inference that that order may well be very ancient, and other orders compared with it be decided innovations⁽³⁾. The Northern-Semitic alphabet, as is well

of the name *Ḥarm*, remarking that حَرْم begins with ح and not with ح, and does not mean "hedge". He says the name rather suggests a connection with ሃርመት "a small stroke". TR.]

(1) Although it should be noticed that the Greeks have no nasal sound either, in the name of their letter ζῆτα (v. HUPF, p. 2).

(2) Certainly not an imitation of *Kappa*, as GESENIUS in 'ERSCH und GRUBER's *Encyclopädie* would have it.

(3) Cf. BÖHMER, ZDMG XVI, p. 579.

an Adjective in the Plural masculine, or feminine. But all other Plurals, particularly those of inner formation (Collective forms), may again be conceived of as compact collective notions, and therefore as Singulars, and either masculine or feminine,—following in fact the same fluctuation which prevails in the Gender of the Singular. In these cases a Plural may just as readily be associated with an Adjective in the Singular masculine or feminine, as with an Adjective in the Plural m. or f. (v. § 135). We meet with **ብዙኃን : ኃዋኣን** Mark 2, 15; **አሕዛብ : ብዙኃን** Mark 3, 20; **አድባር : ነዋኃን : ወአውግር : ነዋኃት** Hen. 1, 6; **ዐቢያተ : ወድሩካተ : ቃላተ** Hen. 5, 4; **ዕፀወ : ብዙኃን** Hen. 32, 3; **ካልኣት : አሕማር** Mark 4, 36;—but also with **ተአምራተ : ዐቢያነ : ወስቡሓን** Hen. 36, 4; **እሙንቱ : ማያት** Hen. 67, 13; **አልባስ : ሠናይት** Gen. 24, 53; **ብዙኅ : አሕዛብ** Gen. 17, 4; **ውእተ : ቃላተ** Hen. 13, 10; **ዝቃት : ብሉይ** Matt. 9, 17; **ማያት : ብዙኅ** Ps. 92, 6; **ምግባራት : ሠናይ**. It may be given as a general observation, that any Plural, whatever be its form, may be joined to an Adjective in the Plural in that gender which belongs to the word in the Singular,—but also that any Plural, or even Plural of Plurals (§ 141) may be conceived of too as a Singular,—in which case it usually takes to itself the Adjective in the Singular and in the readiest gender, the Masculine, although it may also be in the Feminine. But, on the other hand, words which are Singular in form,—if they are either essentially the expression of collective notions, or even have merely a collective meaning in the particular passages concerned—, are joined to the Plural of the Adjective, and that too in the Gender which properly belongs to the individual components of the collective idea: **ብዙኃን : ሰብእ** Mark 4, 1; **ሕዝብ : ጽኑዓን** Gen. 14, 5; Deut. 9, 2; **ሰብሐት : ዐቢያት** “great splendours” (‘great magnificence’) Hen. 65, 12; **ለዘይመጽእ : ትውልድ : ርኅቃን** “for distant future generations” Hen. 1, 2⁽¹⁾; and even **ዐውያተ : ዐበይተ** Hen. 85, 6; *cf.* also **ዐበይት : ዝናም** with **ዐቢያ : ዝናመ** 1 Esr. 2, 49.—An Adjective which admits of an inner plural form, generally assumes it when the Noun, with which it is co-ordinated, has also the Collective form: **ዐናብርት : ዐበይት** Gen. 1, 21; **ተአምር : ዐበይት** Josh. 24, 17; **አሕዛብ : ዐበይት : ወጽኑዓን** Josh. 23, 9; **አበው :**

(¹) [Instead of the last two words here, FLEMMING reads **ርሕቅት**, the *Fem. Sing.* and does not, like DILLMANN, repeat **ትውልድ**. TR.]

ing occasioned the shifting of **ሐ** into the first row, and of **አ** into the second, through which arrangement the juxtaposition of the Gutturals in one and the same row was secured. On the other hand **ረ** may have changed place with **በ**, only when it became necessary to attach **ጥ** to the Ethiopic alphabet, and then **ረ** was finally placed at the end of the second row immediately before **ጥ**.

(3) When men had still a clear consciousness of the twofold division of the alphabet, the two Southern-Semitic sounds **ኀ** and **ዐ** were added, one to each row, and in fact at the end of each row. In consequence, the letter **አ** came to stand immediately before its sister-sound at the end; and, in accordance with the first of the points of view which are being noticed here, **ኀ** was moved on to **ኀ** and in fact placed after it, to separate **ኀ** from **ሐ**.

(4) Then a regard to the similarity of the sounds operated as a last regulative point of view. People wanted to have similar sounds as close together as possible, and only separated them in the several instances by one letter of a different nature, in order that two which were similar might not directly clash together. In this way **ሐ** is brought up to **ዐ**, but is separated from it by **ላ**; **ሐ** to **ዐ** but separated by **ረ**; **ደ** to **ጠ**, separated by **ገ**; while **አ** and **ዐ** at one time did not resemble each other in sound so closely as they came to do later. Thus the *first* row,—originally beginning with **ላ** and ending with **ጥ**,—contains the Liquids **ላ መ ኀ** and **ረ**, together with the two Sibilants **ሐ** and **ዐ**, along with the three Gutturals **ዐ ሐ ኀ** and the three Mutes **ቀ በ ጥ** (**በ** in place of original **ረ**); and the entire series begins with a guttural corresponding to the *Alf*. This row gives the most clear indications of purposeful arrangement. In the *second* row, as compared with the corresponding Hebrew one, still more violent transpositions are to be noticed. It is only **አ ወ ዘ ዩ** which present any likeness to the Hebrew succession. In **ገ ጠ ጰ**, however, we again meet with three Mutes placed together, and in **ጠ ጰ ጰ ዐ** with four Explosives.

I have not up till now met with any deviation from the order developed here⁽¹⁾; yet it is to be noted that POTKEN inter-

(1) An Ethiopic alphabet is met with in the MS. Add. 16240 of the British Museum; cf. DILLMANN, '*Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur*'; pars tertia, Londini 1847, p. 58, No. LXXI.

changed the positions of the 5th and 7th letters **ሠ** and **ሰ**,—an alteration which, provided it rest upon a historic basis, might easily be proved to be the better arrangement.

§ 11. II. With regard to *the Form* of the Ethiopic script, it has already been mentioned that all the letters have been fashioned out of forms presented by the Minao-Sabaic; only the character **ፒ** appears, like its sound, to have been derived from Ψ (or Π?). The letter **ሳ** was at one time very like **ሀ** and seems even to have sprung from it in Minao-Sabaic just by a slight alteration. For *Zai* the Abyssinians took the Minao-Sabaic character for *Dsal*. The origin of the character **ጸ** is still obscure: it might be nearest the mark to recognise in it a new formation from **ሰ** or **ፈ** (in its old form).

Form of
the Script.
Direction
of Writing.

By and by, however, there occurred with the Abyssinians an important alteration in the old mode of writing,—*for it gradually became the custom to write from left to right*. Among the Minao-Sabaeans the writing as a rule ran from right to left, just as it did among the rest of the Semites, with the exception of the Babylonian-Assyrians; sometimes too the writing was *βουστροφύδον*. A few of the older Ethiopic Inscriptions still indicate that the direction from right to left was at one time known also among the Abyssinians; but evidently the example of the Greek mode of writing, which was familiar to the Abyssinians even in pre-Christian times, and especially in Christian times, helped to bring about the gradual establishment of the direction from left to right⁽¹⁾. The practice of writing towards the right had gained prevalence even in the age of RÜPPELL's pair of long Inscriptions; and in books it is met with exclusively.

This gradual change in direction seems to have had no ulterior effect on the form of the characters themselves; the most of them suited either direction. The characters **ገ ጊ ከ** lend themselves even more readily to the new direction of writing than to the old; only **ፈ**, instead of its original curve from right to left, took

(¹) The common view, that the direction of Ethiopic writing to the right is a pure innovation of the Greek missionaries, cannot be maintained. If the opposite manner of writing had been the only one known and allowed before the Greeks brought their influence to bear, then it would be inconceivable how and why this complete reversal of the old method had been arrived at.

the opposite curve. On the other hand in still early times, when writing came into more frequent use, a different position with respect to the ground-line was assigned to several of the characters, in order to give them a more pleasing and symmetrical appearance⁽¹⁾, viz., to **ለ, መ, ወ, ተ, ደ, ፈ**; farther, the character for **ሐ** was reversed. Moreover, the essential and distinguishing lines of a few of the letters were brought more distinctly into prominence (as, for instance, with **የ** and **ቀ**), while in other cases unessential lines were given up (**ኀ** and **ፈ**); and finally all were set at equal height. While sharp corners predominate in almost all the letters of the Minao-Sabaic and ancient Ethiopic script, the natural result of much writing and of consequent efforts to write with greater rapidity was to round these corners off. In this way what took two, three, or more strokes of the pen in old times could be completed in one stroke (as in **ሀ ሐ መ ወ ቀ ለ ኦ ከ ዐ የ ደ ገ ጠ ጸ ፀ**): It is only in characters which have broken lines that the sharper angles remain (**ኀ ኀ**), and in **ለ** and **ሐ**, because the rounding off of these might have led to their being mistaken for **ለ** and **ከ**. Even in RÜPPELL's Inscriptions we find this rounding off of the strokes carried out to some extent, although the angular style would have been easier on stone.

Scarcely a start had been made towards binding individual letters into groups of letters. In RÜPPELL's Inscription II, 38, such a group appears to be met with⁽²⁾; and in Manuscripts too, in the case of the Ethiopic name for God, we come upon the *crasis* of **ኀ** and **ዘ** into **ኀዘ**, and upon the group **ቆ** for **ቆም**, and upon **ገየ** for **ዝየ** &c. But such interlacing is extremely rare and is evidently meant withal for abbreviation (*cf. infra* § 15 N. 2; and § 16 *ad fin.*). Then the peculiar mode of writing the vowels must have set itself against the prevalence of this device (§ 13 *sqq.*). It has thus remained a rule almost without exception, coming down from the most ancient times,—that the several letters of a word be placed beside one another, but independently and without attachment, just as in other old modes of writing.

(1) The notion of HUPFELD (p. 2),—that the shape of the letters was affected by the Abyssinian style of housebuilding,—is more ingenious than sound. It can have no application in the case of **ቀ ወ መ ዐ የ ደ ገ ፀ**.

(2) [This assumption is not confirmed by BENT's accurate copy.]

So much the more it became necessary to separate the several words from one another in some way, if confusion was not to arise. In the Minao-Sabaic, and in the more ancient Ethiopic writing, a perpendicular stroke (|), which is constantly employed in RÜPPEL's Inscriptions, had come into use as a word-divider. This stroke was transformed later on into two points standing the one above the other (:), which bore the name ነቀጥ "points" among the Ethiopians; they are quite regularly and indeed without exception placed after every complete word⁽¹⁾. And this method of separating the words,—which prevents all coalescing of different words,—has also made it possible to break up a word at the end of a line when there is no more room, and put the rest of it into the next line. The introduction of the so-called *literae dilatabiles* has therefore become superfluous⁽²⁾.

VOWEL DENOTATION.

§ 12. III. This mode of writing, inherited by the Ethiopians and farther developed in the way pointed out, was originally consonantal, like all the other Semitic systems except the Babylonian-Assyrian. The vowels in Semitic word-formation are exceedingly changeable and shifting; the consonants are the firm, unalterable portion of the word. It was therefore a subtle conception, suited to the genius of the Semitic tongue that, provided the firm and, so to speak, visible and corporeal portion of the word were written, the spiritual and mobile portion might remain without outward sign.

Vowel Denotation incorporated with Consonantal Script.

Meanwhile it is well-known that none of the Semitic modes of writing adhered to this their first and simplest stage. In consequence of the want of any vowel-marking, obscurity in many cases supervened, and an endeavour was made at a second stage

⁽¹⁾ [In the more recent printing of Ethiopic these points (:) are kept strictly to the function of *separating* one Ethiopic word from another. For instance they are not usually employed now after an Ethiopic word which stands alone, nor even after the last word of an Ethiopic group. TR.]

⁽²⁾ On the Abyssinian method of writing the vowels, v. now also HALÉVY, '*Journ. as.*' VIII, 6, pp. 248*sqq.*, 273 and D. H. MÜLLER, '*Epigr. Denkm.*', p. 69*sqq.*

of development to remedy this defect by employing the semi-vowels (and finer gutturals) as vowel signs for certain long vowels and diphthongs. Then at a third and last stage all vowels were marked by placing various points and strokes above or below the line. Among the Ethiopians also this advance from defectiveness to greater clearness in the writing was gradually effected; but in their case all that concerns this matter was evolved in a quite independent and quite peculiar manner; and the final result was a most complete and accurate system of vowel-marking, which differs entirely from the other Semitic systems, and in some measure resembles more the Indian system.

It is true that the employment of the semivowel characters to make up for long \bar{i} and \bar{u} , or for diphthongs compounded of i or u , was not unfamiliar to the Southern-Semitic tribes; but, compared with the Northern-Semitic systems, the usage was less common. It was only diphthongs that were with comparative regularity written by means of w and y , while these letters were not usually employed to indicate \bar{u} or \bar{i} except at the end of a word⁽¹⁾. Such is the case in the Minao-Sabaic Inscriptions, as well as in the two or three words of the oldest Ethiopic Inscriptions which one can read from existing copies. No proof has yet been given that the finer Gutturals ever came to be used in the South as Vowel signs; and such a use is peculiarly improbable in Ethiopic.

The Ethiopians appear never to have advanced to any more frequent employment of ω and φ to denote \bar{u} and \bar{i} . In the Inscriptions of RÜPPELL,—which indeed have many other vowel signs,—we nowhere find them used with this object, not even in cases where \bar{i} and \bar{u} belong to the root; $\mathbf{h}_\mathbf{u}$ is written \mathbf{h} ; $\mathbf{f}\text{-}\mathbf{w}$, $\mathbf{f}\mathbf{w}$; $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{h}$, $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{h}$; $\mathbf{h}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{t}$, $\mathbf{h}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{t}$, and so on⁽²⁾. Only, Diphthongs proper were continually written with a ω or a φ : and even after the introduction of the new Vowel signs, this style of writing them

(1) Already pointed out by EWALD in HÖFER's '*Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache*' I, p. 302, and by OSIANDER, ZDMG X, p. 35sq.

(2) [The recent copies of these Inscriptions show, however, that they carry out thoroughly the ordinary vocalisation; cf. above p. 10, N. (1).]—If in I, 1 and II, 2 $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{u}$ is met with for the later $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{u}$, that has no bearing upon vowel writing; it merely shows that the construct state of $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{u}$ had at one time a fuller sound.

continued in vigorous use, but yet in such fashion that **w** and **g** were with greater accuracy set down instead of the more general **w** and **g**.

In all other cases, however, the Ethiopians entirely abandoned this path, pointed out to them by the rest of the Semites,—a path which, however thoroughly followed up, would never have brought them to their goal,—and they struck out another path which rewarded their efforts far better, and gave a notable proof of their genius. Starting from the fundamental conception of Semitic writing,—that the written consonant is a body in which inheres unseen a soul, a vowel, by which alone it becomes audible—, they set to work to indicate the kind of vowel present in the particular consonantal character, by attaching to it small strokes or rings. This device was appropriate and sufficient, and being governed by very exact rules it brought about the development of the original consonantal script into a highly perfected syllabary, which for completeness and effectiveness leaves little to be desired. There are short Ethiopic inscriptions in which no trace of this new mode of denoting the vowels can be detected. In the Inscriptions of RÜPPELL it makes its appearance already, half-formed⁽¹⁾. Its beginnings must therefore be referred to no later a date than about the fifth century of our era and may go even farther back. Foreign influences are not to be thought of in this matter⁽²⁾: the invention of the system was the work of the Abyssinian people.

(1) [*Cf.*, however, above, p. 10, N. (1); and p. 24, N. (2).]

(2) DE SACY entertained the singular idea that the Greek vowel-signs somehow served as a model. Then the Syriac new vocalisation-system cannot have any relevance in this matter, seeing that not only is it quite different in its nature but also was just beginning itself to be formed at that remote time. W. JONES, KOPP, and LEPSIUS ventured a guess at Indian influence, and the last-named would also have derived from the same source the right-hand direction of the writing; but the Indian vowel-writing resembles the Ethiopic only in taking in the short *ä*, while in every other respect it is formed quite differently. Nor can I agree with WEBER in what he advances about India borrowing the principle of the Ethiopic mode of denoting the vowels, in his essay "*Ueber den semitischen Ursprung des indischen Alphabets*" (in '*Indische Studien*'). [Perhaps however, DILLMANN's complete exclusion of the *possibility* of foreign influence in this matter has not been altogether justified, even by this Note.]

to the right limb with the effect of lengthening the same; but, in order to prevent the letter from stretching over the base-line, it is made smaller in size, and so presents the appearance not of having the right limb lengthened, but of having the left limb or limbs shortened⁽¹⁾, thus **Α Α Α Α Χ Η Η Η Μ Μ Μ**. (2) If the letter has only one foot, this ought properly to be lengthened; but to avoid passing over the base-line, this prolongation turns off at a right angle towards the left (by way of distinction from *ι*), **Ϡ Ϡ Ϡ Ϡ Ϡ Ϡ**⁽²⁾. (3) If the letter is rounded underneath, then it is propped underneath on the right side **ϣ ϣ ϣ ϣ ϣ**; only **ω** has the prop in the centre **ϣ**. (4) Of the two letters which have a horizontal line below, one—**α**, forms its sign for long *ā* by assuming a more upright position and by lengthening its middle stroke, **α**, while the other, **ζ**, breaks off its horizontal line in an upward direction and attaches the prop to this **α**. (5) Finally, **ι** lets the lower portion of its broken line stand for prop, and completes itself by assuming a new line above, **ι**.

(b) The sign for *ū*, or for *ī*, consists in a horizontal stroke applied to the right side of the letter, which may be considered as indicating a divergence in the pronunciation,—a turning aside from the straight, open *a*-sound. The distinction between the signs for *ū* and for *ī* is made patent by applying the stroke to the lower end of the letter to denote *ī*, and to the centre of it to denote *ū*⁽³⁾. (1) The sign for *ū* is in all cases attachable without farther difficulty: Only, in the case of **ζ** the lower line again has to be broken off, but this time in a downward direction, so that the vowel-line, as distinguished from that lower line, may readily catch the eye **ζ**⁽⁴⁾: In exactly the same way **ζ** must be understood. (2) The sign for *ī* is also of easy attachment to most of the letters: only, in the case of **ϣ ϣ ϣ ϣ ϣ ϣ**, the ground-forms of which are rounded below, the attachment is effected by means of a small auxiliary line. With **α** and **α** the divergence in the pronunciation is signified by the turning upwards of the lower line;

(1) As LUDOLF, in fact, incorrectly supposed was the case.

(2) The hook, attached thereto is not an essential part of the letter or sign, but is a mere flourish both here and in other similar cases.

(3) And yet the reverse proceeding would be more natural, for *u* is the deeper sound, and *i* the higher.

(4) Very deserving of notice, however, is **Ε** = *ru* in the Inscriptions.

and with **ḡ**, the *i*-sign is applied,—perhaps to obviate confusion with **ḡ**,—by means of an auxiliary line in the centre of the letter, **ḡ̇**.

(c) The sign for *ē* is a development of the *i*-sign. The horizontal line, which represents *i*, is bent upwards and back into the letter, thus forming a small ring⁽¹⁾, to represent $\bar{e} = a + i = i + a$ (§ 40). The mode of attachment is exactly the same as with the stroke for *i*; only, in **ḡ** and **ḡ̇** it is simpler than in that case⁽²⁾.

(d) The sign for *ō* is twofold. According to one conception *ō* was an *Ablaut* of *ā*, and so was at first marked like *ā*; but a distinction was speedily introduced, according to which in the case of *ō* the prop was attached to the left side (**ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ**), or in the middle (**ḡ ḡ**); with **ḡ** the same is to be signified by slanting the foot, **ḡ**. According to another conception, however, which we meet with even as early as in the Inscriptions, *ō*, on account of its origin from *u* and *w*, has come to be denoted by a small ring applied to the upper part of the letter,—a sort of small **ḡ**, (**ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ ḡ**); with **ḡ** it is attached to the centre (though, in the Inscriptions, to the top⁽³⁾). But in the case of **ḡ**, to avoid attaching two rings together, a simple stroke put at the head (a kind of higher-placed *ū*-sign) appeared to be sufficient (**ḡ**); and similarly it seemed enough in the case of **ḡ** to place a stroke perpendicularly on the upper line, which stroke, it may be, was originally meant to carry the small circle (**ḡ**). Manifestly writers at one time wavered between these two methods of designating *ō*; but the first seems to have gained the upper hand, and it was only in cases where it could not well be applied that the second method obtained a firm footing.

(e) The signs for short vowels other than *ä*, and for the want of a vowel, meet in a single sign⁽⁴⁾, as has already been mentioned. Forms indicating the Pres-

(¹) This ring might also be explained as an abbreviated **ḡ** = **ḡ**, particularly as the ring more than once denotes *i* in the Inscriptions.

(²) LAURENCE'S *Isaiah-Manuscript* frequently gives **ḡ** as well as **ḡ̇**, e. g. capp. 22, 20; 27, 4; 37, 35.

(³) [In the earliest MSS., and down to the 15th century, the characteristic form of *lo* is **ḡ**; cf. W. WRIGHT, '*Catalogue of the Ethiopic Manuscripts in the British Museum*', London 1877, p. X.]

(⁴) The view that this sign signified at first the weakest vowel-sound, and only in the second line the absence of a vowel—is defended by KÖNIG, p. 58.

ence of a
Short Vowel
other
than *ā*, or
Absence of
a Vowel.

This also, like the sign for *ō*, varies with different letters and has sprung from different conceptions,—a circumstance which is the less to be wondered at here, seeing that the sign has a different value in different cases. In one division of the letters we find an upright line in the letter either broken, or bent in, whether above or below (**υ Δ C ʒ h ʔ T Ɔ T**), or set in a sloping position (**h**),—by which devices the complete breaking off of the direct pronunciation, or, in other words, the virtual absence of the vowel, is probably indicated. With other letters, however, a sign, like the one for *ū* and *ī*,—that is, a horizontal stroke by the side of the letter—has become established. The one sign must originally have had a like signification with the other, and certainly had been meant to indicate a divergence—a bending away—from the *a*-sound. By way of distinction from the signs for *ū* and *ī*, however, it was, as a rule, attached to the left side of the letter, either at the top or in the middle (**h ʔ ʔ ʔ ʔ ʔ ʔ ʔ**), but in other cases to the right at the top of the letter (**ʔ ʔ ʔ ʔ**); with **ʔ**, **ʔ** and **ʔ** it was transformed into a perpendicular line, to save space; and in the case of **ʔ** it was drawn right under the letter. The alphabet was shared between these two methods of designation; and the grounds which led to the one method being adopted in the case of one letter, and the other method in the case of another, were to some extent merely fortuitous, for with **ʔ**, for instance, the same marking might have been looked for as with **h**. But after the vocalisation had become established, the meaning was quite the same, although the sign used might have sprung from the one or the other conception.

In this way seven permanent forms were gradually evolved for every one of the 26 letters, out of very irregular and fluctuating beginnings. In the alphabetic summary the Abyssinians themselves have brought these forms, of seven different kinds, into a definite succession, as is set forth in Table I. Correctly enough they put in the first position the ground-form which is to be pronounced with *ā* and which they called **ʔʔʔ** *i. e.* the *nature* or *plan* of the rest, from which they were developed. The remaining six forms take their names from their order, **hʔʔ** *Second* (Form), **ʔΔʔ** *Third* &c. The order which in this way they have arranged has, to be sure, little to recommend it. It seems particularly inappropriate to put the form, which indicates *ě* or the want of a

vowel, in the sixth place and before the *ō*-form. But perhaps the sixth and seventh forms were assigned their places at the end on historical grounds, because in fact it was known that both these forms were of composite growth, being each of them derived from diverse principles of designation, and that they were the last of all to be reduced to fixed rule.

§ 15. (f) But alongside of these seven forms, possessed by each of the 26 letters, there grew up farther in the case of 4 of the letters 5 new forms for each. As will be explained farther on (§ 26), a special mode of pronunciation was developed with the letters **ገ ገ ገ ገ ገ**, according to which, when they have to be pronounced with an *a*- or an *i*-*e*-sound, a *u* in certain cases thrusts itself between the consonant and the leading vowel. For this *u*-containing pronunciation of the gutturals the perfection of the system demanded special signs. These were developed out of the ordinary designation of the *u* (*i. e.* by a horizontal stroke placed at the side) by attaching in a special way to the *u*-stroke the sign for the leading vowel. To indicate *uē* a perpendicular stroke is placed upon the *u*-sign (**፱ ፱ ፱ ፱**); for *uī* the *ī*-sign is rather attached beneath, the perpendicular stroke reaching over the horizontal line (**፱ ፱ ፱ ፱**); when compounded with the signs for *ā* and *ē* on the other hand the *u*-stroke is shifted to the foot of the letter (**፱ quā, ፱ quē** &c.); to indicate *uā*, the *u*-sign is closed at its end into a ring (**፱** &c.)⁽¹⁾.

Development of the *U*-containing Letters, and their several Forms.

In a later age the *uā*-sign, originally contrived for these four letters, was now and again appended in the signification of *uā* to other letters, namely to **፱ ፱ ፱ ፱ ፱ ፱**; and **፱**, for example, was written for **፱፱**, &c.⁽²⁾. In this way a new kind of grouping of letters is produced, by compressing two written characters into one (*cf. supra* § 11).

The difference of these vowel-signs from one another in their seven respective forms is patent and clear with most of the letters;

⁽¹⁾ For **፱, ፱** &c. **፱, ፱** is often written in manuscripts, *e. g.* **፱፱** [and *uī* seems to be written for *uē* in certain instances in MS. P (14th century) of the *Kebrā Nag.*; v. *ibid.*, *Introd.* p. XV and Note 1].

⁽²⁾ V. the signs originating in this way in MS. 16240 of the British Museum, referred to above, p. 20, Note (1), and in ISENBERG's '*Grammar of the Amharic Language*', p. 4.

but one or two forms become very like each other through the attachment of certain of the vowel signs, and so may easily be mistaken in reading and in writing, viz:—**ሩ** and **ራ**, **ረ** and **ሪ**, **ር** and **ሮ**, **ገ** and **ጊ**, **ወ** and **ዐ**, **ደ** **ደ** **ደ**, **ደ** **ደ** **ደ**, **ፋ** and **ፋ**, **ፈ** and **ፍ**, **ፆ** and **ፆ**, **ሰ** and **ሰ**⁽¹⁾, **ባ** and **ገ**, **ኦ** and **ኦ**, **ዋ** and **ዋ**⁽²⁾. This comparatively early development of a complete vowel-system, which was soon adopted generally in books, gives a great advantage to Ethiopic, as compared with other Semitic languages and modes of writing⁽³⁾, and greatly facilitates the acquisition of the language from the writing, as well as the comprehension of the books themselves. At the same time we must keep in view that not even with the Abyssinians did such a system of Vowel-writing come into existence all at once, fully and symmetrically formed, but that it was perfected only in the course of a considerable length of time. This may farther be proved by manifold errors in the vocalisation of a number of words, especially of proper names which have been established and handed down in the Texts of the Bible from ancient times⁽⁴⁾. Such errors can be explained only on the supposition that in the case of several words the vowel-marking was either entirely wanting, or was somewhat fluctuating and irregular in the use made of the various signs.

§ 16. Apart from consonantal characters and vowel-marks the Abyssinians did not farther develop any special written signs. The distinction between the aspirated (or assibilated) and the unaspirated pronunciation of certain Mutes seems to have been unknown to them. Nor do they ever indicate the doubling of a consonant by any special mark,—although, like the most of

(1) [*E. g.* in the very old Cod. Aeth. 32 of the Bibliothèque Nationale; v. HACKSPILL in *Zeitschr. für Assyriol.*, Vol. XI, p. 368, N. 1.]

(2) **ፌ** for **ፌ** is met with in D'ABB. 55 in *Hez.* 1, 26; 10, 1; M. Faus (MS. XI, last page **ሰፍፌ**); Herma **መሃፌል**.—Ancient and peculiar vowel signs are exhibited by the Cod. Laur. of the Twelve Minor Prophets, in the Bodleian Library. [*Cf.* DILLMANN, '*Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxoniensis*', Pars VII, Oxonii 1848, p. 10sq., No. VIII.]

(3) [But the same, of course, must be said of the Babylonian-Assyrian writing, inasmuch as the signs for simple syllables are recognised as being used in this way.]

(4) In my own editions of Bible Texts I have drawn attention to such ancient errors in many passages.

the other Semites, they write every double consonant once only, except when the two sounds are separated by a vowel. There is therefore a slight defect in their writing in this respect: it is only from the rules of formation or from tradition, that we can determine when a letter must be pronounced as a double one, and these aids do not always suffice.

The sign of the close of a sentence is **ⲁ** [called by the Ethiopians **ጥብ** “drop” or “point”, or—together with **፤**, **ⲛ፡፡** and **ⲁ=ⲁ—፡፡፡፡** “pause” or “sign of pause”],—a doubling of the ordinary word-divider (v. § 11). When this sign has to serve at the same time as a section-mark, it is generally amplified into **ⲛ፡፡** or doubled as **ⲁ=ⲁ**, after which a new line is frequently commenced. Smaller marks of division are not employed, as a rule; **፤**, however, serves this purpose; in enumerations **፤** is very frequently placed between the several words (*e. g.* Henoch 10, 20; 15, 11). In later manuscripts **፤ ፡ ፡፡፡** are oftener employed, but mostly in the wrong place through the ignorance of copyists.

The Abyssinians borrowed their *Numerical Signs* from the Greeks. Whether they ever possessed any of their own,—in particular whether they used their own letters as numerical signs,—we do not know. The Greek signs appear already in the Inscriptions; but an attempt was made, wherever possible, so to fashion the foreign sign that it should come to resemble the character for some Ethiopic letter or syllable: thus **Ϡ** was formed so as to resemble the sign of *šā*, **Ϡ** the sign of *hā*, **Ϡ** the ancient sign of *rū* &c. In this way the ciphers given in Table I were finally evolved. In order that they might be more easily recognised as numerical signs, and might not be mistaken for letters of the alphabet, a small horizontal stroke was applied to them both above and below. In the manuscripts the separating points are usually omitted after ciphers, and **፩** and **፪**, as well as **፫** and **፬** are frequently interchanged⁽¹⁾.

(¹) For **፩** “10” D’ABB. 55 has the sign **፩** Jer. 48, 1. 2. 8. In like manner **፩፡፡፡፡** is met with for **፩፡፡፡፡** MS. Jul. M. a. IX. 14 (*Genzat*), foll. 30, 110; MS. Berol. PETERM. II, Nachtr. XXVIII (*Gadla Abbā Garimā*), foll. 39, 61, 63, 64 &c. [An exceptional way of expressing “100” is **፩፩** in *Kebra Nag.* 141 a 18.] On the *Minao-Sabaic* numerical signs cf. ZDMG XXVI, p. 748 sqq. and ‘*Journal as.*’ VII, 1, p. 511 sqq.

The Abyssinians have no *Abbreviation-marks*. In Texts in which a word is repeated very often, it is of course frequently shortened, but this shortening consists merely in giving no more than the initial letter or the two opening letters of the word and then adding the word-divider, *e. g.* ቀ: for ቀዱስ. Standing abbreviations are not met with (but *cf.* § 11). እስረኤል is written ጸኤል in many manuscripts, as if it had been a compound of ዕሥረ-*twenty* and ኤል. In like manner numerals, even when they do not appear in their pure ground-form, although they are frequently written in ciphers, have yet one syllable,—a suffix, it may be, of the ground-form,—attached in letters, *e. g.* ፪ሆሙ *i. e.* ክልኤሆሙ. In *Genzat* fol. 13 (Cod. Tub. M. a. IX. 14) we read for ‘Hallelujah’ occurring thrice: ሃሌ: ሉያ: ሃሌ: ሉያ: ሃሌያ :: *cf. ibid.* foll. 20, 36, 37 &c.⁽¹⁾

II. PHONOLOGY.

I. THE SOUNDS (OR LETTERS) OF THE LANGUAGE.

1. VOWELS.

Preliminary
Observations. Short
Vowels
other than
ä.

§ 17. When a glance is cast over the stock of vowels in the Ethiopic language, as it is exhibited in the system of vowel writing, consisting of short vowels *ä* *ě*, of long ones *ā* *ī* *ū* and of mixed sounds *ē* *ō*, the attention is arrested by a peculiar phenomenon, viz. that *i* and *u*, which next to *a* are the two chief vowels in all ancient tongues, are wanting in their shorter forms, though represented in their respective long forms, while a sound of the second rank, *ě*, comes forward to take the place of such shorter forms. This cannot possibly be original. The pure sounds *ü* and *ĩ* must once have existed in the speech; and the circumstance that both of them gave place to the more general and indeterminate

⁽¹⁾ [In Cod. Mon. 11 the Divine name is frequently abbreviated: እግዚአብሔ or እግዚአብ or እግዚአ or እግዚ or እግ; it is in that case mostly written with red ink and without the final points (!); so too, ክርስቶ. አ: for አሜን is met with in *Kebra Nag.* 113, Note 14; 159, Note 18; 164, Note 26. ሎ: or ሎዲ: for ለዶቅያ *Laodicea*, and ዓ: for ዐርባዊ is found in Brit. Mus. Or. 2263, fol. 6.]

sound *ě*, may be regarded as a sign of the early inroads of decay on the vowel-pronunciation. We have, it is true, no express information to guide us as to the age of this decay. But we have already (p. 26 *sq.*) concluded from the nature of the vowel-writing, which has no distinctive sign for *ũ* or *ĩ*, that even in the time of the formation of that system of writing, the practice of distinguishing *ũ* and *ĩ* can no longer have exhibited much life, though it might still perhaps be said to exist. The same inference may be drawn from other indications. Nowhere in the language is a different meaning of the word or form bound up with a different pronunciation of the vowel of the sixth class. On the other hand we come upon cases in which an originally short *i* or *u* was prolonged into a long *i* or *u*, to preserve the sound, because it was of importance for the meaning. Forms too, in which the *u* is most essential in all Semitic tongues, like the Passive or the Imperfect of the first Conjugation (Stem) and its Infinitive, have even in the oldest Ethiopic known to us either been completely given up, or have made way for new forms in which the missing sound of short *u* has had its place supplied by other sounds and devices. All this seems to justify the conclusion that even in very early times not merely was the short *i* already pronounced like *e*, but also,—which is still more remarkable,—the short *u* was on the point of fairly disappearing, and was altered into *ũ* or *υ* wherever it could not be lengthened with the help of the tone, and even farther into *ě* ⁽¹⁾, so that in the end the two sounds lost themselves in the indeterminate *ě*. It may be that in some words this *ě* was once spoken rather like an *i*, and in others rather like a *u* ⁽²⁾, but this distinction can no longer have been of importance, and at last it was quite given up. But there is at least one remnant of the original short *u* which has been preserved in many cases, namely after the four *u*-containing consonants, so that *e. g.* ባንባ still has the sound of ቀርባ *querbān* in Ethiopic (v. on this point § 26).

§ 18. (1) The fundamental vowel *a* has still a great predominance in Ethiopic, and is very largely employed in word-formation both as a short and as a long vowel. The *short* *ă* was cer-

The
Ground-
vowel,
Short *ă*.

(1) Compare *e. g.* Hebr. אָמַר or אָמַר from *attām, kām*.

(2) Cf. አስቀፍ = أَسْقَف.

tainly spoken at one time with a pure and unmixed sound, and in most cases must have been preserved in all the greater purity for the reason that otherwise it would have been confused with the other two short vowels, and a leading means of formation would thus have been lost to the language. It occurs with great frequency in distinction from *ě* to convey a special signification of a word (*cf. e. g.* **ገበር** “servant” and **ግበር** “business”). At the same time it shows a tendency even at an early period to take the duller sound of the less pure *ě* ⁽¹⁾—less frequently in an open syllable, as for instance, with **ሰገሞ** and **ሰገሞ** “barley”, but more frequently when it is attracted by two syllable-closing consonants,—so that in forms like **ረምሕ** “spear”, *ä* is often changed into *ě* **ርምሕ** (v. § 105). This transition into *ě* became specially active under the influence of gutturals (§ 45). Besides, *a* is thickened into *ē* when it is lengthened to make up for the doubling of a consonant (§ 56 *ad fin.*). Then too it often stands in foreign words for *γ*, *ε*, *e. g.* **ኢየሱስ** Ἰησοῦς. Again, the softening of the pronunciation of *ä* increased considerably in the course of the Middle Ages: In LUDOLF’s time it was generally pronounced *ä* ⁽²⁾, except when it formed a diphthong with a following **ው**, or had to be spoken after one of the five Gutturals or **ረ** or **ቀ**, **ጠ**, **ኢ**, **ጸ** ⁽³⁾, in which case it was kept purer through the guttural (**ሀ** *ha*, not *hü*). Fortunately this decay did not make its way into the writing; and therefore wherever *a* is written, it is better that we pronounce it *a*.

Long *ā*.

The long *ā*, on the other hand, continued even in popular speech to retain the pure sound of *a*. The fact that in many foreign words *ā* stands for *γ*, *ε*, *e. g.* **ሊቀርዖስ** *Liberius*, should not lead us to infer that *ā* was pronounced like *ē*, but rather that the less pure *ē*-sound was often replaced in Ethiopic by the purer sound of *ā* ⁽⁴⁾. Very often *ā* springs out of *ä* by Tone-lengthening and by the influence of a following guttural without a vowel (§ 46) or by the contraction of *ä* + *ä* (§ 39); but still more fre-

(1) *Cf.* the like phenomenon in other Semitic languages, *e. g.* in Assyrian: ZIMMERN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ V, p. 396. V. also KÖNIG, p. 59.

(2) “*Sonus hujus vocalis tam obscurus est, ut parum a murmure absit, haud aliter ac si quis obscure loquens infantes terrere velit*”.—LUDOLF.

(3) *Cf.* TRUMPF, ZDMG XXVIII [in what follows quoted as TRUMPF], p. 519.

(4) V., on the other hand, KÖNIG, p. 62.

quently it is original, and sustains the sense and meaning of a definite word-form (*e. g.* አሕዛብ “nations”, from ሕዝብ “nation”). Farther it often stands, as in Arabic, for the mixed sound *ō*, particularly in several words of early Semitic, like ቃል ነጻ⁽¹⁾, ዳር ገገ, ዓለም ወንጌ (v. *infra* § 105)⁽²⁾; so also in foreign words ማር ܡܪܝܬ, ሃይማኖት ܡܪܝܬܐ. Of native word-formations in Ethiopic the form of the 3rd Conjugation (Stem) must be referred to here, ኃበአ for ኃበአ compared with ጉባኤ “congregation”, and of a few Quadri-literals, *e. g.* ማሰነ for ሞሰነ, in the Participle Passive ሙሰ-ን.

§ 19. (2) The *short, indeterminate ē* is of very frequent occurrence. It makes its appearance as the shortest and most colourless of vowels:—(1) where a vowel or a slight vocal effort (*Vocalanstoss*, or *Sh'eva mobile*) must be resorted to in order to facilitate pronunciation, *e. g.* ይግበር, እምነ; (2) in the sinking of the fore- and after-tone, before or after a long-toned vowel, *e. g.* ጽባሕ “morning”, ምሥዋዕ “altar”, ትንሣኤ “resurrection”, ኃጥአ “sinner”, ቁናጽል “foxes”. As being the short form for *ū* and *ī*, it springs out of these vowels, when they are shortened, *e. g.* ግብር “made”, in the Femin. ግብርት, መይጥ *mayyet* (and *maît*) for መይጥ, and it is employed in word-formation in all cases in which *i*, *ū* or tone-lengthened *ē*, *ō* are found in the kindred tongues: አምነ “he believed” اَمِنَ, ከብረ “he was honoured” كَبِرَ, ያግብር يَكْتَبُ, ይባርክ يَبَارِكُ, ይንግር يَكْنُبُ ነጋዴ, አንትሙ “you” اَنْتُمْ, ሕግ “law” ሐግ⁽³⁾, እዝን “ear” اِذْن, ልብስ “clothing” لِبْس⁽⁴⁾.

Short, indeterminate ē.

In several forms *ē* is softened out of *ā* (§ 18); more rarely it is shortened from an original *ē*:—እር “how?” ነኔኔ, እንብዩ “I may not” ን ንክ.

In foreign words it may stand for all short vowels, and even, —after shortening has occurred—, for long vowels of every kind: *μυστήριον* ምሥጢር, *σινδών* ስንዶን, *Μανασσῆ* ምናሐ, and መናሐ.

(1) [Better to regard ቃል as = Assyrian *qālu*, but ነጻ as = قَوْل = Assyrian *qūlu*.]

(2) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 67.

(3) [But v. *infra* (§ 25), where a preferable derivation by NÖLDEKE is referred to.]

(4) On a like weakening of *a* into *i* in the dialect of the *Banū Tamīm* v. RÜDIGER, ZDMG XIV, p. 488; cf. FLEISCHER, ‘Beitr.’ St. 2, pp. 275, 317; STADE, ‘Morgenl. Forsch.’ p. 212 [and HUBER, ‘Meisir’, p. 18sq.].

Βενιαμίν ἠንያῶ, σπόγγος ἡφζῶ, Χωθάρ ἡተ, Θεόδωρος ἑῶ
 ድሮስ, *Lucia* ልከያ, Βααλίμ both ሰፃፈ። and ሰፃሊ። &c.

It would seem that the pronunciation of this vowel resembled for the most part our fugitive or obscure *ě*, but sometimes it rather approximated an *i*, sometimes an *o*⁽¹⁾. The older grammarians are not quite agreed about its pronunciation. POTKEN represents it by *ö*,—which, however, must be wrong, according to the evidence of LUDOLF's tutor: WEMMERS taught that the sound was very short, fluctuating between *ě* and *ö*: LUDOLF rendered it by *y* in the first edition of his grammar, and by *ε* and *e* in the second—as did MARIANUS VICTORIUS before him. It is very remarkable that after short *i* and *u* had quite disappeared at a very early stage, the same sounds appeared again from another quarter, as the pronunciation encountered farther change in the lapse of time. In point of fact when **ው** and **ይ** constituted a syllable by themselves at the beginning of a word, they were pronounced *u* and *i* by the later Abyssinians⁽²⁾,—thus, for instance, **ውሉድ** *ulūd*, **ይገብር** *igáber*. This pronunciation is now generally diffused, and seems to have come into vogue in comparatively early times⁽³⁾; but still it cannot be original⁽⁴⁾, and indeed it was always given up again whenever a somewhat closely connected preposition or conjunction was prefixed to the word, *e. g.* **ለውሉድ**, **ለይቁ።**⁽⁵⁾. We shall accordingly transcribe **ው** and **ይ** in all cases by *we* and *ye*. At the end also of a word, according to TRUMPP, p. 519 *sq.* **ው** and **ይ** are pronounced *u* and *i*, when *ā* precedes them, or when *ū* stands before **ይ**, or when *ě* precedes them, which *ě* then must take the tone. When **ው** follows a consonant without a vowel, it is spoken like *u*. Also in the middle of a word **ው** and **ይ**, preceded

(¹) In MS. Berol., Cod. B, PETERM. II. Nachtr. 55 **ጥዕይ** is generally written **ጠዕይ**, manifestly on account of the **ጠ**.

(²) LUDOLF, '*Gramm.*' Lib. I, 5,—just as the Hebrews render י "and", here and there by י, and the Syrians *Yūdḥ* in the beginning of a word, by *ī*. The Abyssinians, however, do not appear to be consistent in their pronunciation of these half-vowels: *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 520.

(³) I conclude this from the fact that even in more ancient manuscripts a negative is here and there wrongly inserted before the 3rd pers. m. of the Imperf. (*e. g.* **ኣይገብር** for **ይገብር**),—an error which can be explained only on the supposition that **ይ** was pronounced *i*.

(⁴) HAUPT, '*Beitr. z. Ass.*' I, p. 17, is of another opinion.

(⁵) Where they neither said *la-ulūd* nor *laulūd*.

by *e*, are pronounced *e-u*, *e-i*, in which cases however *e* has the tone, only when this is fundamental in the form. With a foregoing *a*, **ው** and **ይ** regularly form the diphthongs *au* and *ai*.

§ 20. (3) The *long vowels* *ī*, *ū* mainly appear (1) in forms *ī* and *ū* from roots, of which one of the radicals is a vowel; (2) in the Pronoun and in Formative syllables of pronominal origin; (3) in various Inner Nominal forms, mostly tone-lengthened out of an original short vowel: **ገቢር**, **ገጸን**, **ልሂቅ**, **ገጢአት**, **ገቡር**, **አሐቁል** among others.

Farther *ī* appears occasionally instead of a short *i* founded in the form, only for the purpose of preserving the *i*-sound in greater purity, *e. g.* **መሃፒል** “a fuller” (for **መሃፒል**), **መስጊድ** “house of prayer” **مَسْجِد**, for the rest a foreign word. In some few cases it is thinned down from fuller sounds *ē*, *ā*, *e. g.* **ኢ** “not”, from **ገጸ**, **ጸ**, **ሚ** “what?” from **ገፃ**, **ገፃ**; but regularly it proceeds, in processes of formation, from *ē* as the more simple sound, where *ē* is shortened, *e. g.* **ጊጉይ** “guilty” from **ጊገየ**, **ጊዋዌ** “captivity” from **ጊወወ**. Where *ī* is shortened, it becomes *ě* (§ 19). In many words it is shaded off into the somewhat longer *ē* (§ 21). It is met with frequently in foreign words, not merely for long and short *i*, but also for *υ*, **ቢሶስ** “Byssus”, **ኪርያቅ** *Κυρίακος*; for *η* (in so far as this *i* was pronounced) **ተጉን** *τήγανον*, **ምሥጢር** *μυστήριον*, and even for the diphthongs *αι* and *οι*, as a result of fusing these diphthongs into one sound, **ኢትዮጵያ** *Αἰθιοπία*, **ኪሮ** **ግርልዮስ** *χοιρογρύλλιος*⁽¹⁾.

The vowel *ū* is already fairly in course of transition to *ō* (§ 21). In formative processes it makes its appearance, where an original *ō*, or an *ā* that has arisen out of *ō* (§ 18), is shortened:—**ቱስሐት** “mingling” from **ቱስሐ**, **ሩካቤ** “cohabitation” from **ሩካቤ**. Where *ū* is shortened, it passes over into *ě* (§ 19). In foreign words it corresponds to *υ*, as well as to *u*, *ū*, *e. g.* **ሁሶጲ** (and **ሀሶጲ**) *ύσσωπος*.

Besides, *ī* and *ū* are hardened into their semi-vowels **ይ** and **ው** (§ 40).

§ 21. The vowels *ē*, *ō* are in their origin mixed sounds, *ē* and *ō*. sprung from *ai* and *au* by fusing the diphthong into a single sound. Their origin is still very clear in Ethiopic, for in by far

(¹) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 648qq.

the greatest number of cases they arise here from the blending of an *i* or a *u* with an *a* to which it becomes joined (§ 39sq.); and, having this origin, they are susceptible of being analysed back into their constituent parts, and of passing thus into *ay* and *aw* (*av*)⁽¹⁾. Less frequently they arise from the lengthening of shorter vowels or from *i* and *u* by thickening and lengthening.

In particular *ě* may be lengthened into *ē* through the influence of a following soft Guttural, **ይሬኢ** for **ይርእይ**, **ይቤሉ** for **ይብህሉ** (§ 46); and, without any sufficient grounds of this nature, *ē* arises from *ě* through the mere dwelling upon the pronunciation, *e. g.* **ምዳጌ** (Sir. 27, 20) for **ምዳቀ** *δορκάς*, **ሐቋ** “hip” for **ሐቀ**. In other cases *ē* is thickened out of *ǎ* or *ā*; thus from *ǎ*, and at the same time to take the place of doubling in the Imperfect of the Intensive conjugation (stem), **ይፈጽም** *yefēšem* for *yefúsšem* (§ 95, 2), and from *ā* in a few cases, **ጽሌ** “table” alongside of **ጽላ**, **ሰሚን** “South” **ነጃ**. In several words *ē* has become established in place of an *ī* fundamental to the form, as being a somewhat fuller sound, *e. g.* **ዳቤር** and **ዳቢር** **ገጌጒ**, **ኳሂላ** and **ኳሂላ** “nothingness”, **ባቂላ** “bean” **بَابَا**⁽²⁾. In foreign words it corresponds most frequently to *ε*, *η* and *ει*⁽³⁾: **ቴዎሎጎስ** *θεολόγος*, **ሌጌዎን** *λεγεών*, **ሚካኤል** *Μιχαήλ*, **ጵስጥፔስ** *πιστικῆς*, **ዴብላታ** *Δεβλαθά*, **ሴዴቅያስ** *Σεδεκίας*; and sometimes to *υ*, **ብሬል** *Βήρυλλος*, **ሚሮን** *μύρον*, and to *αι*, **ሐጌ** *Ἀγγαῖος*.

The sound *ō* is produced with great regularity, in certain forms, out of *ū* by compression; thus in the Feminine endings *ōt* and *ō* from *ūt* and *ū* (*e. g.* **ገብሮ**, **ገቢሮት**, **ጸላሎ**, **መለኮት** &c.), probably also in **ውክቶሙ** and in the Suffix pronoun **ሆሙ**; farther, very commonly in words of foreign formation: **مُصَوِّتَة**, **ታቦት** “ark” **تَابُوتَة**, **እቶን** “oven” **أَتُون**, **ሶከር** “sugar” **سُكَّر**, **ዘይቶን** “olive-plantation” **زَيْتُون**, **ሲኦል** “realm of the dead” **سُكَّر**, **ቦርኒ** “coffin” **مَوْجِد**, **ጸላፅ** “rock” **صَلَع** or **صَلَّاع**. In foreign words it stands for *o* and *ω*; the Greek termination *ιος*

(1) [Just as the Guṇa sounds are resolved in Sanskrit. TR.]

(2) It is a different thing when copyists confound *ē* and *ī*,—an occurrence which is very common.

(3) Cf. KÜNIG, p. 68, who assumes for *ει*, however, the pronunciation *ī*, and then the compression of the *ī* into *ē*.

accordingly sounds **ፑከ**; or it corresponds to **ου Ἐρμᾶ** **Ῥουβήλ**, **መርቆሬዎስ** "*Mercurius*", or to **υ Ἑρμῆ** **Κύπρος**, or to **αυ ሞትያዊ** **ναύτης**.

When *ō* and *ē* are shortened, they pass into *u* and *i* (§ 20).

§ 22. All these vowels, once they appear in a word, are as a rule held firmly and tenaciously, and accompany the word without change throughout all its farther forms and augmentations. No trace is met with here of the manifold alterations of sound exhibited by the Hebrew of the Masora as a result of altered conditions in the Tone. In the matter of tenacity and constancy in the vowels of a word Ethiopic ranges itself rather with Arabic.

Pronun-
ciation of
fugitive *ě*

Whether Ethiopic possesses, besides its seven vowels, additional fugitive vowels as they are called, half-vowels, or vowel-touches (*Vocalanstösse*), is a question, which may easily enough be put. But it is a question difficult to answer, partly because too little is known about the mode of pronunciation of words in ancient times, and partly because the question—what is a half-vowel?,—and—what is a short vowel?—is not so easily answered. It is well known that Arabic has a short vowel in all those cases in which Hebrew has merely a *Sh^eva* (*Vocalanstoss*). Other languages less rich in vowels, such as the Aramaic, tolerate groups of consonants also, and give utterance to a fugitive vowel-effort, only where incompatible consonants meet together. Upon the whole, Ethiopic is something like Hebrew in vowel resources: and indeed in its short indeterminate *ě* in cases like **ከረዎት**, **ፋሬ**, **ግበር**, **አስተግብረ** it possesses a sound quite resembling the Hebrew *Sh^eva mobile*; and this shortest and most fugitive kind of *ě* may always be compared with the *Sh^eva*. Other cases, in which an entirely fugitive vowel of this kind has to be resorted to in order to help the pronunciation, will be described farther on. That the *ě* was no longer pronounced here like a vowel, but rather like a mere half-vowel, seems to be evidenced by the fact that in the cases named, wherever it was applied just on account of the nature of the coinciding consonants, the later pronunciation fell into the way of wholly suppressing any intermediary sound,—as in *kránt* (v. on this point § 34). Now between the complete disappearance of the vowel in this position and the utterance of a full vowel, such as we have in Arabic, there must certainly intervene as an intermediate stage the uttering of what was a half-vowel and

nothing more. This question, however, is not important for the phonology or the morphology. It will be enough to notice *when* we should pronounce an *ě* as a sound quite short and fugitive, as cases occur.

2. CONSONANTS.

Prelimin-
ary Obser-
vations.

§ 23. The consonants found in Ethiopic have already been indicated in a general way in the account that has been given of the characters. With the exception of the dull *p*-sound, they are the same with those which constitute the stock of the Northern-Semitic Alphabet, increased by two new Arabic letters. It might seem from this that as regards the consonants of the language there has not been much of a special nature developed in the Abyssinian abodes of the Semites. And yet a comparison of Ethiopic roots with those of the rest of the Semitic languages reveals that while Ethiopic has often retained softer and more slender sounds, or developed them out of harder ones, it exhibits much more frequently harder and duller sounds, in place of the softer sounds of the other tongues. Such preference for rougher sounds is specially declared in the transcription of foreign words. Of still more importance is the fact that Ethiopic has created several types of rougher sounds peculiar to itself. One example is presented in the dull *p* **አ**, which in one or two roots, and also in foreign words takes the place of an original *b* or *p*. Farther, the Abyssinians have transformed into rough gurgling sounds the four Semitic gutturals **א ב ג ד** in a way peculiar to them, by fetching them more deeply from the throat, and joining with them an obscure *u*-sound, which in that very process loses its vowel character and stiffens into the consonantal sound. This rougher pronunciation of the four gutturals has, to be sure, in no respect become general, in the sense of supplanting their usual pronunciation: on the contrary, the latter has kept its ground in by far the greater number of roots; but the rougher pronunciation is nevertheless very widely extended. While, however, these phenomena reveal an impulse in the language towards the development of rougher sounds, such as well befits the mountainous nature of the country, another series, on the other hand, of peculiarities in the pronunciation of the consonants indicates a

certain struggle to simplify the multiplicity of sounds,—(a feature we found also in the vowel-system)—accompanied with an appearance of effeminacy and degeneracy. We find in fact that the three hardest of the five Gutturals (Aspirate-) had their pronunciation gradually softened: **θ** became like **h**, **ʔ** like **h**, and the last two together like **u**. So too we find that among the Sibilants **w** came to be like **h** (š like *s*), and **θ** *ḏ* like **ʔ** (¹) *ṣ*. Thus the Abyssinians first gave up **ʔ** and **θ**,—sounds which had been developed in Arabia and been brought with them from that country,—just as they had in much earlier times given up the hisping transitional letters ط ذ ث. As regards the Sibilants in particular it comes about that Ethiopic prefers decided Mutes, and, still more strongly, decided Sibilants to the transitional letters, and it is precisely on that account that **θ** reverted to **ʔ**. Among the Gutturals Ethiopic could bring about again the coincidence of **ʔ** and **h** all the more readily, after it had contrived the rougher **ʔo** out of **ʔ** (ح). The giving up of š for *s* shows the same striving after simplification. On the other hand the gradual weakening of **θ** into **h** and of **h** and **ʔ** into **u** is a decidedly enfeebling process as well; and as the language had formerly made abundant use of these letters in its formation, the process led to many inconveniences, and can only have become general about the time the speech died out. It is so much the more remarkable, when we see Ethiopic striving, at other points, after the rougher sounds; but yet, along with the simplifying endeavours which have been mentioned, it finds an analogy in the phonetic development of other and even non-Semitic languages. In fact a certain easy-going pronunciation, which gives up whatever causes any trouble, and keeps only the absolutely necessary and essential sounds, frequently prevails in popular dialects. In the other Abyssinian dialects, particularly in Amharic, all these phenomena are displayed, and even in a much more decided fashion.

With these preliminary observations we proceed to describe the various Consonants, their phonetic value, their significance and their mutual interchange. We group them together according

(¹) According to HAUPT's statement ('*Zeitschrift f. Assyriol.*' II, p. 264), the Abyssinians pronounce **θ** as a Fricative (*ts*), while **ʔ** is a Fricative with a firm break. [TRUMPP is also of this opinion: v. TRUMPP p. 578. TR.]

to the organs of speech by which they are produced, and also according to the peculiarities which they exhibit in practice.

Gutturals
(Aspirate-).

§ 24. (1) Of *Gutturals (Aspirate-)* there are in all, five, **ħ o u ʕ ʔ**. Of these **ħ** and **u** are the oldest⁽¹⁾ and the simplest sounds, and are present in other languages as well as in the Semitic: **o** and **ʕ** are of comparatively later origin: **ʔ** is the youngest of all. **ħ** is properly just that gentle breathing which must precede every vowel when uttered separately, and must really follow also a long final vowel,—answering thus to the *Spiritus lenis* of the Greeks. **u**, having more strength and body in it, is our *h*,—the Greek *Spiritus asper*. **o** is connected with **ħ** as a breathing of similar character, which of necessity requires a vowel before or after it, to become audible; but it is harder than **ħ** and is formed by a firmer compression of the throat-orifice. With **u** are associated, first, **ʕ**, corresponding to **ح**, like a stronger *h* (*h*) uttered more deeply from the throat, and next, **ʔ**. **ح**⁽²⁾, produced by friction of the upper part of the throat, and therefore inclining rather to *k*, *ch* or *kh* (*q*). **ħ** and **u** are the weakest and softest Gutturals: in certain circumstances they may completely coalesce with a vowel immediately preceding them (*cf. infra* § 47).

The (Aspirate-) Gutturals represent a double step-ladder of stronger and weaker breathings, one end of which borders, with **ħ** and **u**, upon the vowels, and the other, with **o** and **ʔ**, upon the consonants, and first upon the Palatal-Gutturals. This intermediate position of theirs between the vowels and the consonants explains also their wide extension in the Semitic languages. They make their appearance with considerable frequency in root-formation, when roots, of which one of the radicals is a vowel, endeavour to acquire a third consonantal sound. In that case the weaker sounds, which were in the root at first, are condensed into the harder breathings, mainly through the influence of the other two radicals. In fact this is particularly clear in Ethiopic roots; and those which contain Gutturals are accordingly exchangeable

(1) EWALD, '*Ausf. Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*', 6th ed. p. 74.

(2) LUDOLF has noticed that **ʔ** corresponds to **ح**.—Now-a-days **u ʕ ʔ** are spoken just like *h*; v. TRUMPP p. 518.

with those in which vowels appear in the corresponding positions (¹). On the other hand these breathings are also found originating from firmer consonants, especially from the Palatal-Gutturals and Mutes, by such consonants giving up their firm consonantal element and retaining only the breathing as the remains of it. Thus **h** often stands in Ethiopic as first radical in place of *Kāf*: **አሴር** “old woman” alongside of **كَبِير**, while the pronunciation **ከብረ** in Ethiopic bears rather a spiritual (figurative) sense, **አረገ** “to be old”, beside **كَجَرَج**, **አለደ** “to gather”, with **كَلَزَ كَلَدَ**; farther in several Ethiopic words **ሐ**, **ኀ** are very commonly exchanged for **ከ**, e. g. **ሐወሰ** and **ከወሰ** “to stir”, **ረስሐ** and **ረኸሰ** “to be unclean”, **ናሕንሐ** and **ነከነከ** “to shake”, **ዝክር** and **ዝኀር** “monument”, **ሰሊኖት** and **ሰሊከ** “cassia”; **ተከዚ** “river” belongs to **ውሕዝ**, **ሐረሠ** “to lie in”—to **ከርሥ**, **ሐሰወ** “to tell a lie”—to **كَذَبَ كَذ** (خاس). More rarely **ሐ** or **ኀ** corresponds to a *Geml*: **ሐመዳ** “snow”—to **جَمَد** (in contrast with which **ሐመድ** “ashes” belongs to **خَمَد**), **ማኀብብት** “vat, pit”—to **جُب**, **ሕንብርት** “navel” to **بُجْرَة**, **ሕንብርብሬ** “scab”—to **جرب**, **גרב**. Still more frequent is the substitution of the rougher gutturals for *Qāf*, e. g. **ኀጸረ** “to be short” **قصر قصر** (حصر), **ሐፈሠ** “to rake up” **קפץ קפץ** (but **ح** in Arabic also), **ጽሕም** “beard” **יָקַן**, **ዓምዓም** “swamp” **قَمَقَام**, **ፀጠነ** “to fumigate with incense” **קטר קטר**, **עתר**, **קטר**. On the other hand the simplification of a sibilant into a mere guttural breathing is not so common in Ethiopic, though perhaps **ሐረ** “to go”, may be ranged with the Arabic **سار** (²), and **ረትዐ** “to be straight” with **زَل** (³); the language in other cases prefers to keep by **ጸ** and **ጠ**, even where other tongues admit **ፃ** in place of them. Farther, the Gutturals are subject also to active interchange with one another, just as in the rest of the Semitic tongues; and upon the whole it is impossible to fail to notice that here the harder letters

(¹) It is universally recognised that the harder sounds of an original form pass into the softer, and *vice versâ*, under the influence of a softer or a harder consonant in the root, e. g. **ሐዘበ** alongside of **ሐሰበ** (influenced by the **ሰ**).

(²) EWALD, p. 74.

(³) *Vice versâ*, **ፀረረ** “to revile” is probably related to **הרהר**.

seek to dislodge the softer. It is true that Ethiopic in many cases retains **h** and **u** even where they pass into harder sounds in other languages; as, for instance, **ክባል** “limb” into **هبل** (هبل), **ክፋከያ** “ring” into **ክፍ**, **ክፍ**; **ከፍ** “to fear”, **فرخ**; **ከህለ** “to withdraw” **وَحَل**; just as farther it has no **u** in the formative syllables of the Causatives, but an **h**; yet the harder letter more frequently appears for the soft one of other languages, *e. g.*: **ህጥለ** “to full”, **أَبَل** and **وَبَل**; **ሀገር** “town”, probably for **سحر**⁽¹⁾; **ዐጸድ** “a court”, **اصد** and **وصد**, and so in several roots that begin with **o** (§ 70 *ad fin.*); **ኀዳል** “stag”, **أَيْل**, **أَيْل**; **ሕሠም** “guilt”, **هَظْم**; **ኀሰሰ** “to make gain by usury”, **رَاح**; and **ኀድክ** “to drive” appears also in harder form as **ኀድክ**; **ኀሕሠ** “to retire”, **جَهَش**; **ለከፈ** “to be troubled”, **لَهَف**; **ከጉለ** “to perish”, **هَلَك**; **ኀሕበበ** “to grow mouldy”, **شَهَب**; **ከኀወ** “to be jealous”, **سَكَر** (سَكَر). **ከሥላሳ** “new-moons”, **شَهْر**; **ከሥላሳ** “new-moons”, **شَهْر**. In a number of instances also **o** answers to a **u** of other languages:—**ዐመፃ** “injustice”, **هَمَس**; **ዘውዐ** “to meditate”, **هَوِيَ**; **ዐሥዐ** “to be insatiable” (**شَسَع**) belongs in the last resort to the root **وَحَش**. On the other hand Ethiopic frequently has **h** or **ኀ** for **u** of the other tongues: **ርኀበ** “to be hungry”, **رَغِب**; **ኀብኀ** “to dip in”, **رَبَعَ**; **ኀሕድ** “cedar”, **صُعد**; **ኀንከ** “to be on the watch”, **نَظَرَ**; **በኀከ** “to scarify”, **بَضَعَ**; **መልኦሕት** “cheek, jaw”, **مَلْهَعَت**. Both modes of exchange show that different languages altered in different ways the softer gutturals into the harder. The keenness with which the stronger sounds in Ethiopic for some time sought to dislodge the weaker ones, may best be gathered from the fact that in this tongue **o**, **ኀ** and **h** have pushed their way even into several pronominal particles (§ 62, 1 b), while in the other tongues this department at least has been kept free from them. Even the Greek *Spiritus lenis* and *Spiritus asper* are expressed not merely by **h** and **u** (**ኀስራኤል**, **ኀልፋ**, **ኀሮድ**, **ያኖስ**, **ኀሌኒ**, **ኀላርያ**, **ኀፊኒዎስ**), but also by **o**, **ኀ** and **h**,—so that, in names of Hebrew origin, Ethiopic in several cases again coin-

(1) EWALD p. 347.

cides with the Hebrew pronunciation (**ḥ-n-l-ḥ**, **ḥ-n-ḥ**, **ḥ-n-ḥ**, **ḥ-n-ḥ** “Irene”)(¹).

Of course even when the language was endeavouring to develop harder gutturals, the softening of the harder ones was not impossible, although it was of comparatively rare occurrence: thus, for instance **ḥnn** “to command, to rule” seems to have been formed at a very early time from **onnn** “to be strong” **עז**, **عز**, by the gradual smoothing down of the **o** into **ḥ** in the more frequently used sense of “to command”. But in a later age, when the language had long been fully formed, a tendency in the pronunciation of the gutturals—the very reverse of what had hitherto prevailed, and arising from causes which are not yet properly cleared up—gained a very notable predominance (§ 23). The hard sounds were gradually softened; **ʾ** was reduced to the level of **ḥ**, and both together to that of **u**, and **o** to that of **ḥ**(²); and the entire way that had been traversed hitherto was retraced, until the starting-point was reached, at which the Semitic tongue had nothing but **ḥ** and **u**. It is possible that, besides the influence of Amharic, the frequent intercourse, which took place with populations speaking non-Semitic languages, helped forward this smoothing process in the hard sounds. The retrogression took effect at first in pronunciation only, and not in written character; but gradually the deterioration invaded the written character also; and then, in many cases, **ḥ** and **o** on the one hand, **ḥ** and **ʾ** on the other, and less frequently **ḥ**, **ʾ** and **u**—came to be exchanged for one another without the slightest distinction. The latest manuscripts go much farther in this direction than the more ancient ones(³); and yet the deterioration never became so general as to permit the alternative use of the harder or the softer letters at pleasure in every single word. For example, the **ḥ** of the Causative Conjugations (Stems), or that of the Pronouns **ḥ-z-t**, **ḥ-l**, or that of the roots and words **ḥ-z-k**, **ḥ-n-k**, **ḥ-n-k**, **ḥ-z-k**, **ḥ-z-k**, **ḥ-z-k** &c., is never written **o** in the better class of manuscripts; nor is the **o** ever written **ḥ** in **ḥ-l**, **ḥ-l**, **ḥ-l**, **ḥ-l**, **ḥ-l**, **ḥ-l** and so on. **ʾ** and **ḥ** are oftener

(¹) Cf. KÖNIG, pp. 64, 66.

(²) Just as in Samaritan and Mandaean.

(³) [V. the Introduction to the ‘*Kebrā Nag*.’ p. XIV.]

exchanged; but yet in certain words they are more firmly retained, *e. g.* በዝኅ, ድኅኒ, በጽሐ and so forth. Properly speaking, it is only in the latest manuscripts that we find **ሐ** or **ኅ** written for **ሀ**; and in certain words like ከሀን, ብሂል, ከሀለ, ሀለወ it is not so written, even in them; but, on the contrary **ሀ** is rather frequently employed for **ሐ** or **ኅ**⁽¹⁾. Thus the deterioration in pronunciation could never have become quite universal; and the correct form has often held its ground still more tenaciously in writing. In poems, however, **ከ** rhymes with **ዐ**, and **ሀ**, **ሐ** and **ኅ** rhyme with one another.

The firmer
Gutturals
(Palatal-).

§ 25. 2. (2) *The firmer Gutturals (Palatal-)*, with which **የ** is also reckoned, come next in order to the Aspirate-Gutturals. Of these there are three, the soft **ን**,—always pronounced as *g* (hard), never as *dj* (*dzh*)—, the hard **ከ** *k*, and the hollow-sounding **ቀ** *q*. The first two may with equal justice be called *Palatals*, seeing they are formed on the boundary between palate and throat; but the last of the three is decidedly more of a throat-sound or Guttural, being formed by a compression of the throat and a sharp breaking off of the stream of air (*Explosive*)⁽²⁾ and having a peculiarly Semitic character. In foreign words the Ethiopians employ, as a rule, the hollow-sounding letter for *k*, *e. g.* ቀኖና, ቁድሮስ, ቄስጦንጢኖስ, ቆሮንቶስ, and thereby again evidence their inclination for rougher pronunciation. It is only in a minority of cases that they render *k* by **ከ**, as *e. g.* in ከሚን *κύμινον*, or by **ኅ** even, as in ኅንዳኬ *Κανδακή*. They employ **ከ** oftener for *χ*⁽³⁾, as if **ከ** had to be more aspirated, in contrast with the pure explosive **ቀ**, *e. g.* መኑኮስ, ሚካኤል, ሲራክ, አስኬማ, ካሚሌዎን (though here and there also **ኅ**, as in ከኀን *σχῖνος*), or for *γ*, by hardening it after their manner, as in ከልባን “*galbanum*”. So too ከስ is found for *ξ*:—ስንከሳር *τὰ συναξάρια*, አርቶዶክሳዊ *ὁρθόδοξος*, ስጳለክስ *σπάλαξ*.

In Ethiopic itself the harder letters alternate in a few words with the softer ones: መሰከ and ወሰቀ “to bend (the bow)”, ሐነከ

(1) The more precise treatment of these questions belongs to the province of the Lexicon. Whoever wants to learn the language, must familiarize himself from the outset with these possible phonetic changes, both in using the Lexicon and in reading what has been written.

(2) ISENBERG, ‘*Gramm. Amh.*’ p. 6, and WALLIN, ZDMG IX, p. 10 *sqq.*

(3) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 64.

and **ሐንቀቀ** “to be anxious”, **ዐረከ** and **ዐረቀ** “to be friendly with”,—in which cases **ከ** appears to be the original letter; **ኳኳ** and **ቋፅ** “raven”. On the other hand **ከ** is now and then softened to **ገ**, *e. g.* in **ጽጉ** and **ስከት** “street” (**שוק**, **سُوق**); and even **ቀ** is found exchanged for **ገ** in **ገማ** = **ቃማ** “necklace”.

Changes still more marked are exhibited, when Ethiopic roots are compared with the corresponding roots of the other languages⁽¹⁾. Ethiopic has often the harder pronunciation: **ቀፍር** “capital (of a pillar)”, **כפר**, **כפר**, **גפר**; **ደቀሰ** “to be sleepy”, **دُكاس**; **ፅቋን** “cream”, **عَجْوَة**, **عَكِي**; **ልህቀ** “to grow up, to become old”, **בָּלַח**, **כָּהַל**, **כָּהַל**; **ቀተረ** “to shut up”, **קָטַר**, **קָטַר**, **קָטַר**; **ሞቀ** “to be warm”, **מוֹךְ**, **מוֹךְ**, **מוֹךְ**; or **ረከሰ** “to be unclean”, **رَجَس** and **رָكَس**; **ቁልቁለ** “to roll away”, **גָּלַגַל**; but at least quite as frequently it preserves the softer pronunciation: in fact **ከ** for **ק**, *e. g.* in **በክ** “emptiness”, **בּוֹק**, **בּוֹק**, **בּוֹק**; **ከሳድ** “neck”, **قَسَوْد**⁽²⁾; **ከዕሴ** “dung”, **قَعْس**; **ለከወ** “to become dull (of sight)”, **لَق**; **ለከየ** “to wrangle”, **لَقَعَ** and **لَقَا**; **ከሰየ** “to bear a surname or a by-name”, **قَرِي**; **ከኅት** as a secondary form of **ቀኅት** “sting”, “point (of a spear)”, **قَنَآة**, **قَنَآة**; **ናክክ** “groaning”, **נָאָה**, **נָאָה**, **נָאָה**; **ዘርከየ** “to calumniate”, “to be jealous”, **زَرَق**; also **ገ** for **כ**, *e. g.* **ሀጉለ** “to perish”, **הָלַךְ**, **הָלַךְ**; **ነገድ** “race”, **נִגְד**; **ገድገድ** “to knock”, **כָּדַד**; and **ገ** for **ק**, *e. g.* **ሕግ** “law”, **הָק** (but according to NÖLDEKE = **هَظ** “a proof”); **ደግደገ** “to be lean”, **דָּק**; **ግብጽ** “Egypt”, **قِبْط**; **ስጉርድ** “leek”, **قِرْط**; **ጽጉ** “street”, **שוק**, **سُوق**.

But the effort made by Ethiopic to reach stronger sounds is clearly revealed in the thickening of the Aspirate-Gutturals of other tongues into these hollow guttural forms. Thus **ገ** for **ס** in

⁽¹⁾ On the nature and pronunciation of **ቀ** (**Ḳ**, **m**) *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 518; HAUPT, ‘Beitr. z. Assyriol.’ I, p. 15; EDGAR ALLEN, ‘Proc. Am. Or. Soc.’ 1888, p. CVIII sqq.; on the relation of **ቀ** to **غ**, PRAETORIUS, ‘Amh. Gram.’ § 45, c; ‘Tigrināgramm.’ pp. 18, 100; ZDMG XLI, p. 686; v. also *ibid.* XXXVII, p. 449; and REINISCH, ‘Bilinsprache’, p. 12, No. 6.

⁽²⁾ [But in Assyrian there is an answering word, ‘*kišādū*’.]

ፀጋም “left hand”, **شَام**; for **ḥ** in **ጸገወ** “to be gracious” (‘friendly’) and **ጸገዩ** “to bloom”, **زها**; for **ḥ** in **ገበጥ** “colic”, **حَبَط**; **ምጉጠይ** “ox-goad”, **ጠገጥ**, **خاط**; **ሰም** and **ሰሐም** “arrow” (*Gadla Adām*); for **y** in **ጸገበ** “to be satisfied”, **شبع**, **شبع**; **ሰገኖ** “ostrich”, **صِعُون**; **ጎደጎ** “to abandon”, **خدع** (**خدج**); **ጸጉር** “hair”, alongside of **ሥዕርት**⁽¹⁾; and with special frequency for **غ**:—**ሠገረ** “to run swiftly”, **شغَر**; **ሰገገጐ** “to mock”, **زَغَزَغ**, **زَغَزَغ**; **ገሚ** “cloud”, **غَيْم**; **ገመ** “to pollute”, **غَمِن**; **ጊሰ** “to be up betimes”, **غدا**; **ጊዩ** “to sin”, **غَوَى**; **ገገጸ** “to tremble with terror”, **غَصَّ** &c. In a similar manner **h** for **ḥ** in **ምክረ-በ** “temple”, **مِحْرَاب**⁽²⁾; **ከተማ** “tip (extremity)”, **خَاتَم**; **ከከማት** “warm baths”, **حَمِيْمَة**; **ከንቱ** “in vain”, **هَنْت**; **ከለለ** “to be giddy”, **هَلَل**. Finally, **ፈ** for **ḥ** in **ሠረፈ** “to rise (of the stars)”, **شَرَق**, **شَرَق**; **ጣቃ** “obscurity”, **مَوْح**, **طَحَاطِح**; for **غ** in **በቅል** “mule”, **بَغْل**; **ቀንቀኔ** “an insect (a moth)”, from **غَن** “to buzz”: for **ع** in **መጠቀ** “to raise on high”, **مَتَعَ** (**مَتَح**); **ንደቀ** “to build”, **نَصَب**.

§ 26. (3) But as if the rough Guttural-Aspirate **ኀ** and the hollow Guttural **ፈ** were still not enough, Ethiopic has increased the roughness both of these two, and of the other two Gutturals **ገ** and **ከ**, by pronouncing them with an obscure *u*- or *o*-sound immediately following, and yet in such a way that that sound is not fully formed into a vowel, but is interrupted in its formation and is turned merely into a means of roughening the consonantal sound⁽³⁾. These letters, like other consonants, must be supplied with a vowel, before they can be spoken: as to the formation of the vowels which come after them, see § 41. We may call them the *U-containing Gutturals*⁽⁴⁾. This peculiarly hoarse pronunciation

(1) V. KÖNIG, p. 65 sq.

(2) [But this is a mere *transcript* of the Arabic word, **ح** being the ordinary, recognised equivalent of **ከ**, in such transcribed forms.]

(3) The Latin *lingua, quaero* &c. exhibit a similar sound, though not so rough.

(4) On the nature and pronunciation of these letters cf. TRUMPF, p. 520; KÖNIG, p. 41 sqq.; on their origin from the Cushitic, REINISCH, ‘Die Bedäue-

occurs only with the Palatal-Gutturals. **ʾ** participates in it merely as the strongest of the Guttural-Aspirates, but does not assume it with anything like the frequency that the three other letters do. The cases which exhibit the development of the *u*-containing pronunciation of the gutturals invite a short additional survey, and the following propositions are the result⁽¹⁾.

(1) In the great majority of cases this rougher pronunciation is brought about by a *u*-sound, which at one time was uttered after the guttural in the ground-form of the word, but which forthwith,—either because of having to give place to another vowel in the course of farther alteration of the word, or independently of such cause,—took refuge within the consonant, and clung to it irremovably as a roughening addition. (a) Thus a *u*, *o*, or *w* in foreign words, making itself heard after **ʾ**, **ḡ**, **h**, or **ḥ**, makes its way into the consonant: **ḡṇṇḥṇṇṇ** *πεντηκοστή*; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *ἀναγνώστης*; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *ἐπαγομένη*; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *Κυριακός*; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *a proper-name*; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *Constantine*; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *قَلْزَمَ* (*Clysmā*, town near Mt. Sinai); **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** *Ancyra*, and a host of others. (b) In many Ethiopic words a *u* or *o*, grounded in the form, which has disappeared in the forms of other words unprovided with a guttural, has endeavoured to save itself by making its way into the guttural (§ 17), *e. g.* **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “offering (gift)” **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “threshing-floor”, **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “stem (of a tree)”, **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “costus” (v. *infra* § 105); **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “firstling”, **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “those” (as well as **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**), from **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “kidney”, **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**. Frequently too a radical *u* or *o* has thus made its way into the guttural that precedes it: **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** and **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “brother”; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “hip”, **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “ornament”, from **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “street”, from **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “a rock” (for **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**) from **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**, **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “to be hard”. Some other words leave it optional to exchange the full *u*-sound for the rougher and shorter *ue*, *e. g.* **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** and **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** for **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** and **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “cities”, and **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ**; **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** and **ḡṇṇṇṇṇṇ** “scraped

Sprache (Vienna 1893), vol. II, p. 26 sqq. MALTZAN has also heard these sounds in the Mehri; v. ZDMG XXVII, p. 261 sq.

(1) TUCH also deals with this subject in the first of the two *Commentationes* cited above, p. 14, Note (1). His results agree for the most part with my own.

together". In other words too,—particularly in those which were originally Passive Participles, but which have gradually become Substantives—, the *u* has been permanently modified in this way: **ሐጉር** "raisin", for **ሐጉር**; **ነቀጥ** "point", for **ነቀጥ**⁽¹⁾ &c. Even when a *u* fell to be made audible in the ground-form, not immediately after the guttural, but after another radical which preceded or followed the guttural, it has been attracted to this last: **ሐቀ** "cedar-wood", from **حَبَق** through the softening of the *b* into *w*; **ልገት** "abyss", **لَجَّة**; **ተዙላ** "jackal", **شَوْلَا**; **መቀዕል** "marrow", **مُكَال**, **ጘ**; as well as **ልጓም** "bridle", from an original **لُجَام**; **ጽጉድ** and **ጽጎድ** "cedar", **صُعد**. (c) In a similar way this *u* has also invaded verbs and roots. Sometimes, when original roots (middle *u*) received farther development, the *u* found refuge in the guttural: **ቁጥዕ** "to loathe", **קוט**; so too **ቁጠጠ** "to be slender"; **ዐቂረ** "to wrap up", **قَار**; **ፀቂነ** "to hedge in", from **ضاق**; **ቁረረ** "to be cold", **קור**, **קָרַר**; **ሰቂቂ** "to covet another's goods", **שוק**; **ባጉብጉ** "to rot", **بَاخ**, **بَغَا**, **بَجَو**; **ሰከዮ** "to go astray", **שָׁג**, **שָׁגַג**, **שָׁגַג**; **ከሰነ** "to judge (to establish)", **כָּנַן**; **አአከተ** "to give thanks", **كَب** and **كَبَت** (with softening of the *b* into *w*); **ጉሐቂ** "to bend, to be distorted", **جَوَق**, where *u* has made its way into both the gutturals, &c. In other cases the verbs have been derived from nouns which had a *u* in the formation: **ለጉመ** "to hold in check"; **ቁለዘ** "to hew off"; **ቁስለ** "to receive a wound"; **ነቂረ** "to be one-eyed" (**נקיר**); **ቋረፈ**, **አመገጸ**, **አቂረበ**, **ከሰተረ**, **ጉንደዩ**, **ተርገመ**, **መንከሰ**, **ተመሥከተ**, **ጓሐለወ** &c.; compare also **ባቀዕ** "to be serviceable", with **فَعِّل**.

(2) In a few words and roots *ua* or *ue* is of onomatopoeic character, as in **ቋዕ** and **ኳኳ** "raven", "crow"; **ጉን** and **ጉጋ** [and **ዢን** and **ጉጉ** *Kebra Nag.*] "bittern"; **ቁርኅኅት** "frog"; **ጉርዔ** "throat", "gorge"; **አንጉርጉረ** "to murmur"; perhaps in **ጉሥዕ** "*eructavit*", unless rather as derived from **جُوش**,—and in **አንቋዕ** "hurrah!".

(1) [Better, however, to regard this word as a *pluralis fractus* =

(3) In another series of words this roughening seems to have made its appearance because of the guttural having undergone a degree of softening from its original pronunciation, and to make amends, as it were, by a second hardening. Thus **ገ** appears to have come from **h** in **ሀጉለ**, **ጉድክ**, **ጉድጉድ**; **ገ** from **o** in **ደጉጸ**, **ጸጉር**; **ገ** from **φ** in **ሰገጉጉ**, **አገጉዕ**; **h** from **φ** in **ለሐከ**, **ከሰዩ**, **ከኖት**; and **h** from **ሐ**, **ኀ**, in **ምከራብ**⁽¹⁾, **ከሐሰ**. A similar process may be noticed in another guise: thus, for instance, in **አገል**, **አጉልት** &c., the **o** has first been softened into **አ**, and the hardness has been subsequently restored by means of the *u*-sound combined with **ገ**.

(4) By and by, however, this *u*-containing pronunciation proceeded to make its way into many words and roots, simply from a general preference in the language for such sounds, although we are not now in a position to indicate the special motives for its exercise, or, on the other hand, to show how the motives hitherto suggested have by no means brought about the same result in all the cases in which it was apparently possible. But the other phonetic relations of the word seem invariably to be taken into account in this matter. Roots altogether weak seek thereby to gain greater fulness of sound, *e. g.*: **ጉየየ** “to flee”; **ጉጉክ** “to hasten” (جاء); and in cases like **ከሐሰ** this pronunciation is manifestly easier than **ከሐሰ**. It is particularly common and in high favour before a **ረ** (about thirty times in Ethiopic words), but less so before Aspirates. Before **ለ** it occurs about fifteen times, before **ኀ** about twenty times, before **ሰ**, **ሠ** some fifteen times, and before **ጸ**, **ፀ** about ten times. Though more rarely, it still does occur before the other letters, with the exception of radical **ወ** and **በ** (but yet it is found in the reduplicated conjugation **በጉብጉ**, while before **ረ** it appears only in **ከፋር**). It never occurs, however, before any one of the other three gutturals, except of course when the *u*-containing guttural is itself doubled, and the two forms of the doubled letter are separated by a vowel,—in which case the rougher pronunciation is repeated. Farther, this pronunciation seems to have established itself in certain roots in order to distinguish them from others of a wholly different meaning, but which otherwise would have the same sound:—compare **ጉለቄ** [*var.* **ጥለቄ**, *Kebra Nag.*] with

(1) [But v. p. 50, Note (2).]

ኀልቀ; **ተቂልቂል** with **አንቀልቀል**; **በቂል** with **በቀል**; **ሰከዮ** with **ሰከዩ**. Finally, when two gutturals (though separated by another letter) occur in one word, the establishment of the *u*-containing pronunciation in the one often brings about the same thing in the other: **ኀለቂ**, **ጉሕቂ**; farther **ድርከኩት** “door-hinge” (Fem. from **ድርከኩ**, ‘that, in which the door moves backwards and forwards’).

It must farther be noticed⁽¹⁾, in conclusion, that many words and roots fluctuate between the *u*-containing and the common pronunciation of the Guttural, or else do not employ the first throughout in every one of their several forms (compare **ቂረፀ** and **ቀረፀ**; **ቋረፈ** and **ቀረፈ**; and the roots **ቂጸረ**, **ሰቂረ** and **ዘንጉጉ**). Also, words which are in frequent use, like **ዝኩቱ**, **እልኩቱ**, endeavour by gradually shaking off that pronunciation to simplify themselves into **ዝከቱ**, **እልከቱ**.

§ 27. (4) *The Dental-Lingual Mutes* **ደ**, **ተ**, **ጠ**. Through the co-operation of the tongue and the teeth, there are formed—besides the Liquids, which we are not just now considering—the soft letter **ደ** *d*, and the hard letter **ተ** *t*. Ranked with these, just as **ቀ** is with the Palatal-Gutturals, we find a hollow, explosive sound **ጠ** *t*, peculiar to Semitic languages, which is formed through the co-operation of the tongue and the palate, “by bringing the root of the tongue up to the back part of the hard palate”⁽²⁾. Precisely as **ቀ** and **ከ** are employed in the Guttural class for *κ* and *χ* respectively in foreign words, so in this class the Greek *τ* is usually rendered by **ጠ**, *e. g.* **ሄጳዲጠን**, **ልጥር**, **ምሥጢር**, **ሚጥራ**, while the Greek *θ* or *τθ* is given by **ተ**, *e. g.* **ሊቶስጥራ**, **ማቴዎስ**, **ማትያስ**, **አትሮንስ**, **ትስብያዊ**⁽³⁾.

These three letters are pretty sharply distinguished in Ethiopic roots; and **ተ** and **ጠ** are but rarely exchanged, as in **ነተነ** and **ነጠነ**, **ነትዐ** and **ነጥዐ**⁽⁴⁾ with somewhat different meanings: so too **ተብዐ** “to be manly” and **ጠብዐ** “to be steadfast” (تعب). In the beginning of a word **ተ** is frequently softened into **ደ** (§ 73).

(1) V. TUCH, ‘*Comment.*’ I, p. 18—22.

(2) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 518.—On the emphatic consonantal pronunciation in Ethiopic there are various notices and theories, which however do not accord with one another: cf. MOORE, ‘*Proc. Am. Or. Soc.*’ 1888, p. XXX sqq.

(3) [Cf. GUIDI, ‘*Le traduzioni degli Evangelii in Arabo e in Etiopico*’, Roma, 1888, p. 34, Note.]

(4) [V., however, ‘*Kebra Nag.*’ 39, Note 29.]

When compared however with the other Semitic languages, Ethiopic exhibits several changes in these letters. It has somewhat rarely the softer **ṣ** for **ṣ**, as in **ከṣነ** “to cover”, **ṣኸ, ṣኸ, ṣኸ**; **ከṣነ** “to build”, **ṣኸ; ṣኸነ** “to be obscured”, **ṣኸነ, ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “mountain” **ṣኸነ, ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to quench, to blot out”, **ṣኸነ, ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “a little”, **ṣኸነ**; also **ṣ** for **ṣ** in **ṣኸነ** “to kill”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “incense”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “gnats”, alongside of **ṣኸነ**. More frequently it shows the stronger and harder letters in place of the softer; thus probably **ṣ** for **ṣ** in **ṣኸነ** “to investigate”, **ṣኸነ**; perhaps in **ṣኸነ** “gift”, alongside of **ṣኸነ**; **ṣ** for **ṣ** in **ṣኸነ** “to measure”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “point”⁽³⁾, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to adhere” (as by glue), **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to alter, to exchange”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to exact compulsory service of”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to rend” **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to make strict enquiry”, **ṣኸነ** II; **ṣኸነ** “strictness”, **ṣኸነ** “to be strict”; **ṣኸነ** “to explore carefully”, associated with **ṣኸነ**, **ṣኸነ**, although **ṣኸነ** also occurs often, in the meaning, “to be small”;—the same letter is used for **ṣ** in **ṣኸነ** “to raise on high”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “sweetness”, **ṣኸነ**, and **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to mislead, to deceive”, beside **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to sound” (‘to wind the horn’), **ṣኸነ**. In many of these roots Ethiopic possesses the **ṣ** in common with Arabic, and in opposition to the Northern-Semitic tongues.

Farther **ṣ** often answers to **ṣ**, and **ṣ** to **ṣ** and **ṣ**, *e. g.* in **ṣኸነ** “to accuse”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to act unfairly, faithlessly”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “Pleiades”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to acquire”, **ṣኸነ**; **ṣኸነ** “to sew”, **ṣኸነ**, and **ṣኸነ** and **ṣኸነ**, although these Arabic lisping sounds pass over, in other instances, into full sibilants (§ 30). **ṣ** corresponds frequently to **ṣ**: **ṣኸነ** “to scarify”,

(1) Cf. Assy. *nadānu* ‘to give’, **ṣኸነ** (between two *n*’s), HAUPT, ‘*Sum. Fam.-Ges.*’, p. 43.

(2) V. HAUPT, *l. c.* p. 74.

(3) [Cf. *supra*, p. 52, Note (1).]

بضع; **አጠቀ** “to gag”, צִפּ, ضاق; **ጥርስ** and **ዕርስ** “a molar tooth”, ضرس; **ጠግዐ** “to adhere to”, ضجع; **ጠፈር** “vault”, صَفْر.

Finally, in contrast with other languages, a marked substitution of Dental-Lingual Mutes in exchange for the corresponding Sibilants has to be noticed. Thus, they said **ድሕከ** “to be lame, to limp” for **حك**; **ድምፅ** “whispering”, for **שֹׁמֵר**; **ደፈኒ** “to hide”, “to lay aside”, for **דפן**; farther **ትለቤ** “flax”, probably equivalent to **عَرَس**, **جَهْل**, **عَرَش**; and, to conclude, **ጠርአ** “to cry” (along with **እርኅ**), **صرأ**, **صرخ**, **צָרַח**; **ቀጥቀጠ** and **ቀጽቀጸ** “to grind, to bruise”; **ጠቀር** “soot”, connected with **سقر** and **صقر**; **ጥዕዩ** “to be in health”, **كَا** = **ጽሕወ**. On the converse side of this exchange v. § 30.

Labial
Mutes.

§ 28. (5) *Labial Mutes* **፡**, **ፈ**, **፳**, **ፕ**. The rest of the Semitic languages have only two Mutes formed with the lips, viz. the soft **፡** and the hard **ፈ**. With the Northern-Semites each of the two letters is given, sometimes with an aspirated, sometimes with a hard, unaspirated utterance. The Southern-Semites [and the same is to be said of the Babylonian-Assyrians] know nothing of the distinction observed in such two-fold pronunciation, but give to **፡** the sound of *b* (or even utter it still more softly, like a *v*), and pronounce **ፈ** with aspiration, not however as *ph*, but as *f*: indeed to an Arabian mouth at least the pronunciation of a *p* is not possible⁽¹⁾. The Abyssinians, however, have contrived to form this harder, unaspirated sound, that is to say, *p*; but as if they too had been, at least at first, unable to utter a pure *p*, they have done so in a peculiar phonetic fashion. Either the *p* is strongly and suddenly puffed forth by a vigorous effort of the vocal organs,—constituting thus in the class of Labials an emphatic letter **፳** ⁽²⁾—

(1) WALLIN p. 23.

(2) The best description of this letter is given by ISENBERG, p. 8, where, speaking of **፳** as “the explosive letter of this class” he says “the breath puffs off from between the lips, before the vowel is heard”. V. in this reference WALLIN p. 10: “in order to produce such an explosive sound, one vocal organ must be pressed against another to form a closure, and by the sudden opening of the same the air enclosed behind it is expelled to articulate the explosive letter”. V. also KÖNIG, p. 45 sq.—Compare the emphatic utterance of **፡** among certain Jews, ‘*Journ. as.*’ VI, 16, p. 517, and among the Syrians, ‘*Journ. as.*’ VI, 13, p. 476 sqq.; NÖLDEKE, ZDMG XXXIV, p. 572.

corresponding to the emphatic **ϕ** and **μ** in the two foregoing classes; or else it is given with a slight sibilation—*p^s* **T**—as in the Greek **ψ**. This view of **T** at any rate seems to follow from the old name *Psa*; but at the same time it must be observed that LUDOLF and ISENBERG expressly denote the pronunciation of **T** by that of our own *p*⁽¹⁾: it must accordingly have had the sound of *p* in later times at least. The first of these two letters,—**ⲧ**—, was certainly developed independently of Greek⁽²⁾, for neither the character nor the name of the letter points to a Greek origin, and it is by no means in foreign words merely that it makes its appearance, but in genuine Ethiopic words and roots. In such words it originates as a rule out of a *b* made hard and hollow in sound:—**ⲧⲕ** “to throw, to hit (to shoot)” — belongs to **ⲙⲉⲃ**; **ⲕⲕⲕ** “to catch with the mouth something that has been thrown”, to **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** (**ⲕⲕⲕⲕ**); **ⲙⲉⲃⲧⲕ** “a quiver” (*pharetra*), to **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ**; **ⲕⲕⲕ** “boot”, to **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ**; **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** “to pervert, to overturn”, to **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ**. Yet it may also spring from **ⲁ**:—**ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** “to sever the limbs, to break”, **ⲕⲕⲕ**; **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ**. Of unknown derivation are the names **ⲕⲕⲕ** “chamaeleon”; **ⲕⲕⲕⲕⲕ** (‘name of a disease’). In certain other words also, *b* seems to have assumed even in early times the form of a harder but less dull *p*-sound; but it was not until a new character for *p* had been introduced by the Greeks, that this harder pronunciation could be expressed in writing: **ⲟⲩⲧⲕ** “to full”, **ⲟⲩⲧⲕ**, **ⲟⲩⲧⲕ**; and **ⲕⲕⲕ** “ambuscade, snare”, **ⲕⲕⲕ**, **ⲕⲕⲕ**, **ⲕⲕⲕ**. The Greek **π** is now expressed sometimes by **ⲕ**, sometimes by **ⲕ**, and sometimes by **ⲕ** and **T**: **ⲕⲕⲕⲕⲕⲕ**, **ⲕⲕⲕⲕⲕⲕ**, **ⲕⲕⲕⲕ** : **ⲕⲕⲕ**.

(1) ISENBERG also calls it *Pa* merely, not *Psa*.

(2) Contrary to LUDOLF. The whole account of these letters given by LUDOLF is unsatisfactory. He thinks that **π** was at first rendered by **ⲕ** and **ⲕ**, and that later an endeavour was made to domesticate the *p*-sound as **ⲕ**, from which there sprung however a ‘*novus*’ and ‘*mirabilis sonus*’:—that, still later, people learned the correct pronunciation of **π** and added the letter **T**, and often used it at that day. The words in which **ⲕ** and **T** appear are mistakenly regarded by him as pure foreign words. The only thing that is true in this representation is, that in later times **T** is more frequently employed in foreign words; but often enough, even in later times, the other three labials are also used for *p*, especially in the foreign words which were introduced through the intervention of Arabic.

ሰፍንግ ሰዕጋጋጋ, አስፋሬዳ ሰሙደገገ, በሊቃርጸስ, ሰራጽዮን and ሰራፍዮን, ሰናፔ ሰናፔ. On the other hand ፈ is used for ϕ , but also ጸ and ፒ when a full vowel does not precede: ሰጸር ሰፍላጽ; ሰንፔር ሰፍፍዮስ.

The other two letters በ and ፈ frequently exhibit mutual interchange, when we compare Ethiopic with the other tongues. An Ethiopic በ is confronted by a β in the other languages,—in the following words, for instance: በቀዕ “to be profitable” $\beta\epsilon\mu\beta$; ምብኢህ “bellows”, $\beta\omega\mu$, $\beta\epsilon\mu$, $\beta\alpha\chi$; ብዕዛ “a kind of antelope” (also “a small flute”), $\beta\alpha\gamma\omega\varsigma$ ⁽¹⁾; ዐንበዛ “to be drained, exhausted”, probably $\beta\epsilon\mu$. In ነጠበ “to drop”, $\beta\epsilon\mu$, and ነጠፈ “to filter”, both the letters have been kept, though with different meanings. β corresponds to an Ethiopic ፈ in ንዝፈ “to be compact”, $\beta\epsilon\mu$; $\beta\epsilon\mu$, $\beta\epsilon\mu$; $\beta\epsilon\mu$ “to embrace”, $\beta\epsilon\mu$; ነጸፈ “to become dry”, $\beta\epsilon\mu$; $\beta\epsilon\mu$, $\beta\epsilon\mu$; አዕቀፈ “to cause offence”, $\beta\epsilon\mu$; ለፈጸ “to knead” (if not “to besmear”), alongside of ለብ “to knead”, corresponding to $\beta\epsilon\mu$ and $\beta\epsilon\mu$.

But these Mutes border also upon the Semivowel ω through በ; and, on this ground, changes not unfrequently occur in Ethiopic, just as in other languages, both within the language itself and when faced by other dialects: thus we have the expressions $\theta\omega\eta$ “to be weak-limbed”, and $\theta\omega\eta$ “to be weak”; $\phi\eta\mu$ and $\phi\eta\mu$ ($\phi\eta\mu$) “to prick, to perforate”. ω corresponds to a β , β in $\alpha\eta\omega$ “to utter lies”, $\beta\omega\eta$, $\beta\omega\eta$; $\eta\alpha\omega$ “to cover with”, $\beta\omega\eta$; $\omega\alpha\omega$ “to be irresolute”, $\beta\omega\eta$; በ to a ω in $\phi\eta\eta$ “tip, sting”, $\phi\eta\eta$. These exchanges appear also in proper names: ስልፋንዮስ *Sylvanius*; ሊቀርዮስ and ሊባርዮስ *Liberius*.

An exchange of like nature makes its appearance between the Mutes and the Nasal of this class⁽²⁾: ባልሐ “to extricate”, $\beta\omega\eta$; በርኅ “to be bald”, $\beta\omega\eta$ (cf. $\beta\omega\eta$); ሐርበደ “to wallow in the

(1) [The meaning of this word is quite uncertain. And it may be proper to say here generally, that not a few of the comparisons, ventured upon by DILLMANN in this chapter, are very doubtful, if some of them be not demonstrably erroneous.]

(2) An analogous phenomenon is met with in the Minao-Sabaic dialect; v. ZDMG XXIX, p. 606sq.; XXX, p. 704sq.

mire", حَرَمَد; ሀበ "to forge (metals)", نهم; ሃግሮ "tiger" becomes in Amharic ኃበሮ. Conversely, ዐተመ "to be passionate" answers to عتب; and ሠግረ "to approve of", "to delight in", goes back in the end to شمر (شمر, عجب).

§ 29. If we glance once more over the three classes of Mutes, we must observe that the distinction between an aspirated (or rather assibilated) and an unaspirated pronunciation no more found admission into Ethiopic than it did into Arabic. We have seen, it is true, that **h** often answers to **χ**, and **†** to **θ**, and may conjecture accordingly that in foreign words **h**, **†** and perhaps also other hard and soft letters, may have been spoken with an aspiration. But in the case of native words no such inference follows. As regards the hollow-sounding letters on the other hand, it is established that they can never stand for foreign Aspirates, unless the aspiration be falling away at the same time.

No distinction recognised between an Aspirated (or Assibilated) and an Unaspirated pronunciation of Mutes.

Reciprocal exchanges between Mutes of different classes are exceedingly rare, and appear to be confined exclusively to the earliest formative stage of the language. Relatively the most common is the exchange between **†** or **h** and **ḥ**; ወሰከ "to add to" is (وسق); ተረፈ "to be left over", ترك; ሐይቅ "shore", حافة. A very ancient exchange of **†** and **h** appears in the Pronouns of the 1st and 2nd pers. (§ 65).

§ 30. (6) *The Sibilants*,—five in all,—belong to the class of Dental-Lingual letters. Among them **h** answers to **ʃ**, as the clear and soft letter (*z* of the French and English); the harder **ḥ** (the firm *s*) to **†**; **ʒ**, the emphatic Explosive Sibilant, to **m**. And these three leading letters, at least, Ethiopic has always carefully distinguished. When comparison is made with Arabic, **h** is not only **ز**, but also **ذ** (as even the character **h** has come from the Minao-Sabaic character for **ذ**—§ 11⁽¹⁾), unless it is rather **ذ** that slips back into **ʃ** (§ 27); and **ʒ** is not merely **ص**⁽²⁾, but also takes the place of **ظ** (with the like limitation, § 27). Alongside of these three letters all the Semites have developed another sister-letter to **ḥ**, somewhat rougher and more sibilant, namely

(¹) Cf. also HOMMEL, ZDMG XLVI, p. 536.

(²) [Later, however, when **ʒ** had become *affricata*, **ص** was represented by **ḥ**; v. LITTMANN, 'Zeitschr. f. Assyr.' XIV, p. 84, Note 1.]

§ 31. But these Sibilants also fluctuate a good deal among themselves; and in no class of letters are exchanges between the individual letters so prevalent as in this⁽²⁾. We are still keeping out of sight here the special relation which holds between *w* and

Fluctuation and Interchange of Sibilants

(¹) ТУСН р. 88qq.

(²) In this feature Ethiopic quite resembles Arabic.

ሰ on the one hand, and between ጸ and ፀ on the other (which will be considered farther on), and are attending merely to the three stages **ዘ**; ሰ, ሠ; ጸ, ፀ. (a) We frequently come upon the softest letter **ዘ** as an alternative form for ሰ (ሠ) or ጸ, or else taking its place: ሐሰበ “to think, to suppose” and ሐዘበ; ሰበረ “to shatter” and ዘበረ in መዝበር; መሥመር “a line” and መዝምር; ምዝር “beer” and ምዘር; for other cases v. § 57; and similarly the root ፀመደ “to bind” (ጠፎ, ضبد) appears besides, with a slightly different meaning, as ዘመደ. Cases are more common, in which Ethiopic has only **ዘ** for the *s* or *ṣ* of other tongues: *e. g.* for *s* and *ṣ* ዘበጠ “to smite”, ሠፈነ; ዘውዑ “to meditate”, ሠነዛ; ዘንግዑ “to tattle”, سجع and سهج; ዘብዳ “a skin, hide”, سبد; ዘፈር “border”, شفر; ገዝፈ “to be thick”, جنب; ገዝገዝ “mat”, حشيشة; መዝመዝ “to stroke, to rub”, مش, ممش, مزمن; more rarely for *ṣ*: ዛፍራ “something yellow”, صَفْرًا; ቤዝ “Morning-star”, related to باض, بض; ሕምዝ “poison”, حمض, حمز. (b) The medial letter ሰ, ሠ often answers to the softer *z*, *ḏ* of the other tongues:—ረሥኡ “to grow old”, رزأ, رث, رذی; ሠሥሠ “to sprinkle”, نثا, نثا, نثا; ወሰነ “to determine, to fix limits”, وزن; ሳሕሰሐ “to agitate, to move backwards and forwards”, وني, وني, زح, زح; ሰሰለ “to depart”, زال, زال; ሰርም “the flood”, agreeing with the Arabic شَرْم, but contrasting with the Hebrew ירם (cf. also the instances given in § 30, where ሰ corresponds to a *ḏ*, *ḏ*, or *ḏ*). But in other cases ሰ or ሠ has been retained where other languages already have *z* or *ṣ*:—ሠሐቀ “to laugh”, ضحك, ضحك, ضحك; ሐፈሠ “to sweep up”, حفش, حفش; ፈሥሐ “to rejoice”, فرح, فرح; አስፈር “jaundice”, صَفَر (v. ዛፍራ *supra*); ሰፈወ “to hope”, هف, هف; ቍስል “wound”, قَصَل, مزل; አንበስስስ “to glitter”, بَص, بَص, بَص; and in other Words within Ethiopic itself it exchanges with ፀ:—ሰፍሕ and ፀፍሕ “breadth”, صفح, صفح; ርሕሰ “to be moist”, and ርሕፀ “to sweat”, رخص, رخص, رشح. (c) But certainly still more common is the appearance in Ethiopic of the hardest letter ጸ or ፀ for softer ones present in other languages. For several cases, in which ጸ answers to *ḏ* and *ḏ*, v. § 30. It corresponds to a *z* in words like ጽሕም “beard”, زبي[?];

ጸገወ and **ጸገዩ** (§ 25), زها; **ላጽቂት** “lizard”, لَرِيْق; **ለፈጸ** (ለ-ሰ) “to knead”, لَبَز; **ነጽሐ** “to be pure”, نَصَح, with ባ, زكا. Still more frequently it stands overagainst a **س** or **ش**:—**ጸገጸ** “to prick”, “to stab”, دَعَس, دَعَس, دَعَس; **ጽልፅ** “ulcer, wound”, سَلْعَة, but **ጸበተ** “rocks”, “caverns”, سُلُوع, سُلُوع; **ጸበተ** “to swim”, سَبَح; **ጸጉር** alongside of **ሥፅርት** “hair”, answering to **ሠጽ**, شَعْر; **ጸገበ** “to be satisfied (*satur*)”, شَبِع; **ጸወ-ፀ** “to summon”, شَوَّع; **አንፈርዐጸ** “to leap”, compared with **ጸፈክ** “to hate”, شَنَأ; **ሰቀጸ** “to rake together (the fire)”, بَكَث, بَكَث; **ጸነወ** “to smell”, شَمَم, شَمَم[?]. In Ethiopic itself **ሰ** also appears as an alternative for **ጸ** in **ሰኩት** and **ጸጉ** “street” (ሠባ) ⁽¹⁾; and in § 73 reference is made to an example of even the **ሰ** of the Causative Conjugations being deadened into **ጸ**. Similarly too **ፀ** has often originated from **ش** and **س**:—**ቁፀረ** (ቁጸረ) “to confine, to conspire”, قَصَرَ, قَصَرَ; **ፀጋም** “left hand”, شَأْم; **ፀመረ** “to fasten”, سَمَرَ, سَمَرَ; **ፀወወ** “to take prisoner”, سَبَا, سَبَا; **ፀፂ** “worm”, عُتَّة, عُتَّة; **ፃፂ** “moth”, سُوس, سُوس; **ጉፃጉፅ** “a rugged road”, جَشَّش.

From the survey that has just been made of the multiform phonetic interchange between the letters composing this class, it becomes clear as regards the relation of **ሰ** to **ሠ** and of **ጸ** to **ፀ** ⁽²⁾, that **ሰ** and **ጸ** are the chief letters of the second and third stages. They predominate throughout the language, and **ሠ** and **ፀ** appear much less frequently. Where the letter **ሠ** does make its appearance, it answers generally to a **ش** or **ث**; yet even in that case it is often supplanted by the simpler **ሰ**:—compare **ሰርበ** “to drink”, شَرِب; **ሰቀለ** “to weigh”, شَقَلَ, شَقَلَ; **ሰትረ** “to rend”, شَتَرَ, شَتَرَ; **ሰበ** “to grow grey”, شَاب, شَاب; and so too **ሰሕበበ** “to become mouldy”, شَهَب (سَهَب); **ሰብ** “tinder”, شُبُوع; farther **ሰይጣን**, **ቀሳር**, **ቀሰጠ**, **ቀስፍ**, **በሰረ** and many others, which either invariably, or nearly so, are written with **ሰ**. As the speech more

(1) This is more doubtful in **ሰምዐ** and **አፅምአ**.

(2) According to KÖNIG, p. 47, **ጸ** and **ፀ** are roughened utterances of what were originally Explosives, *ts*, *dʒ*.

and more took this direction, the letter *s* gained such predominance that *š* gradually disappeared, and *s* was used instead⁽¹⁾. In poetry **ሰ** and **ሠ** rhyme together; and when Amharic began to be reduced to writing, consciousness of the original phonetic value of the character **ሠ** had been lost so completely, that a new character **ሸ** was invented to express the Amharic *š*. Unfortunately this deteriorated pronunciation had such an effect on the writers of manuscripts, even in the case of the older manuscripts, that **ሰ** and **ሠ** were exchanged at the fancy of the scribe, and at the present moment we are in doubt about which is the more correct method of writing certain words, particularly those of comparatively rare occurrence. But yet there were several words, which this capricious confounding of the two letters was never able to affect, either because of **ሠ** still preserving a somewhat different pronunciation from **ሰ**, or because of the power of tradition, in the matter of writing, proving too strong for caprice. Roots, like **ነሥክ**, **ሠሀለ**, **ሢመ**, **ነግሠ**, **ከሠተ**, **ወሥክ** and others, are never found written with **ሰ** in the better class of manuscripts; and conversely, roots, like **ለብሰ**, **ነፍሰ**, **መሰለ**, **ማሰነ**, **ረሰዩ**, **ቀደሰ**, **ብእሰ**, **ሰምዐ**, **ሰመዩ**, **ሰብዐ**, **ሰደደ** and others,—are never written with **ሠ**. But farther, the Abyssinians soon lost the original pronunciation of **ፀ** as a mute, as well as of **ሠ**, and suffered it to revert to the sound of **ጸ**, out of which it had sprung. Hundreds of years ago **ጸ** and **ፀ** had come to have exactly the same pronunciation; and they rhyme together in poetry. Meanwhile we can no longer discover from the appearance of **ፀ** in the individual words concerned, at what time this reversion of the pronunciation may have commenced. We still meet with a good many roots (v. *supra*), in which Ethiopic has **ፀ** in place of a simpler sibilant in other tongues; but on the other hand we meet with not a few, in which already ض takes invariably the form of **ጸ**, e. g., **ጸረብ**, ضرب; **ጸበበ**, ضَبَّ; **ጸጥ**, ضَرِيطَة; **ጸፈነ**, ضَفِن; **ጸፋዐ**, ضَفَع. When too **ፀ** and **ጸ** gave quite different meanings to several roots, which otherwise had the same sound, the confusion of the two characters in writing was never so marked. It is only in one or two words

(1) Cf. SCHRADER, 'Monatsber. d. K. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin' 1877, p. 79 sqq., and HAUPT, 'Sum. Fam.-Ges.', p. 68.

that such confusion occurs with any frequency. It is curious to observe how Ethiopic sought gradually to revert to the original condition of the sounds of Semitic speech,—the letters **ኀ**, **ዐ**, **ሠ** and **ዐ** being undoubtedly of comparatively late origin,—by ceasing, little by little, to distinguish between **ኀ** and **ሐ**, **ዐ** and **አ**, and **ዐ** and **ጸ**.

§ 32. (7) *The Liquid and Softer letters*, viz. the Nasals **መ** and **ኀ**, the Linguals **ረ** and **ለ**, and the Semivowels **ወ** and **ዩ**—:

Of the *Nasals* the labial **መ** is the more definite and therefore the firmer; the dental **ኀ** is the more general, and as it borders on the Linguals it exchanges with them. In their mutual relations, however, the one Nasal not infrequently passes over into the other.

It has already been shown (§ 28) how **መ** exchanges with the labial Mutes. It exchanges in the same way with the Semivowel **ወ**:—on the one hand instead of **መሰከ** “to draw the bow”, **ወሰቀ** is also used; on the other, an initial **ወ** is hardened into **መ** in **መዓር** “honey”, **ዛዩ**; **መዐደ** “to counsel”, **ዛዩ**, **عظ**, **عد**, IV, **ዛዩ**; and in the more Amharic **መዘነ** “to weigh” (Ge'ez **ወሰነ**, § 31), **وزن** ⁽¹⁾. It is not often that the more definite **መ** arises out of the general Nasal **ኀ**:—in **ዘመወ** “to commit fornication” (another form being **ዝኒት**), **ዘነ**, **زنا**, and in **ጸሐም** “beard”, **ዘነ** [?], **ذَقَن**, *n* certainly appears in all the other Semitic tongues; in **አቀምጥዐ** “to till the ground thoroughly”, **መ** seems to have come from *n* under the influence of **ጠ**. On the other hand with comparative frequency *m* becomes *n* (§ 57).

The other Nasal, **ኀ** is more liquid and fugitive. Thus it may disappear entirely, particularly in the end of a word (§ 58), or enter with ease into a short syllable which has the tone, to strengthen it (§ 58), or replace the first sound in any double-consonant whatever (§ 58). It also comes readily out of **ም** before a dental or lingual Mute, whether in native or in foreign words (§ 57). Thus too it frequently replaces in roots the more definite **መ**: **ተባህረ** “to fail”, “to withdraw”, **بهم** IV and V; **ጸነወ** “to smell”, **أَسْلَمَ**, **أَصْلَحَ**, **صَلَحَ**, **شَم** [?]; **ሰነሐ** “bald”, **صَلَحَ**, **شَم**, but also **أَسْلَمَ**, **أَصْلَحَ**; **ቀነጸ** “to leap”, **قَص** and **قَلَص**. On the other hand **ኀ** and the liquid lingual **ለ** pass, dialectically, the one into the other: **ረሐነ**

(1) More frequently has **ወ** become **መ** in Amharic; ISENBERG, p. 38.

“to spread (housings) over”, **رحل**; **ḥ-ṛ-ḥ** “to get off, to escape”, **וּחַל**, **דחל**, **זחל**; **חנח** “chain”, **שִׁשְׁלָה**, **שִׁשְׁלִיל**; and **חנח** “a cymbal”, **צִלְצִלִים**, **צלצל**⁽¹⁾; conversely **חחח** “to hate”, **שנח**, **שנא**⁽²⁾. The exchange between **ח** and **ז** does not so readily occur; and when it does occur, it may be regarded as brought about by the intervention of **א**; thus, no doubt, in **חמח** “to fumigate”, (together with **חחח**) from **חמח**, **חמח**, and perhaps in **חחח** “to repay”, **שכח**, **שכח** and **שכח** (*cf.* also **חחח** “to stagger”, **חחח**), and **חחח** “rain”, **חחח** (*cf.* also **חחח**); [contrast, however, Assyrian *zanānu*, *zunnu*].

Of the two *Liquid Linguals* **ז** certainly inclines rather to the Aspirate-Gutturals; and although here it does not,—as partly it does in Hebrew,—share at all in the other peculiarities of the Gutturals, yet it often brings about the gurgling *u*-containing pronunciation in the Palatal-Gutturals which precede it (§ 26), in which tendency it is followed by **א** (*v. ibid.*). In their mutual relations, **ז** and **א** frequently pass into one another, but only in root-formation. In fact at the end of a word, **א** is a more favourite letter in Ethiopic than **ז**, thus—**חחח** “to paint” (“to fashion”), **חחח** (**חחח**, **חחח**); **חחח** “to punish”, **חחח**; **חחח** “member”, “limb”, **חחח**; **חחח** “to burn”, along with **חחח** “to be hot”, **חחח**, **חחח**, **חחח**; **חחח** “foliage”, **חחח** and **חחח** XI⁽³⁾. In the interior of a word this exchange is found in **חחח** “hammer”, from the root **חחח**; **חחח** “lentils”, **חחח**: the harder **חחח** is found as a secondary form of *galgala* in Syriac also. **א** shares with **ז** in the weakness of being capable

(¹) Perhaps also *Dent*, the name of the 19th letter of the Alphabet, from *Dalt*.

(²) On the exchange of *am* and *al* (through the intervention of *an*) in the Arabic of Yemen, *v. Mufaṣṣal*², p. 103, l. 8; on the modern Arabic popular pronunciation **أَمْبَارَح** (*embāreh*) “yesterday” (for **أَلْبَارَح**) *v. TRUMPF*, ‘*Sitzber. d. philos. philol. u. h. Cl. d. k. b. Ak. d. Wiss.*’ 1877, Part II, p. 119.

(³) Thus too in foreign words, but mostly following the lead of the Septuagint, **א** exchanges with *r* and *n*, *e. g.*, **חחח-א** for **חחח-ח**, **חחח**, **חחח-א**, **חחח-א**, **חחח-א** &c.

of a complete disappearance in the end of a word (§ 58), just as it exhibits the faculty also of bringing over to its own sound a foregoing *m* or *n* (§ 54). That *r* besides may pass into *s*—seems to follow from **ሥሐ** “it is better”, alongside of **ሥር** “good”, **خَيْر**: compare also **ደምሐሐ**, **دمس** and **دمر** ⁽¹⁾.

Finally, the two Semivowels **ወ** and **ደ** are, along with **አ**, the softest and most liquid of all the letters, and they are constantly changed for the corresponding vowels (v. *infra* § 49 *sqq.*; cf. also on **ወ** and **ደ** *supra*, p. 38 *sq.*). On the other hand they are much more definitely marked off from one another than in the other Semitic languages, and they maintain themselves tenaciously when they have once taken root,—without **ወ**, for instance, passing into **ደ**, through the influence of an *i*, or **ደ** into **ወ**, influenced by a *u*. It has already been shown, how **ወ** is softened out of other labials, or hardened into them (v. §§ 28 and 32). As first letter of a root, it often corresponds to *n* of other languages (§ 68); but this phenomenon is not to be explained as a softening of *n* into *y* or *w*, but as a variety of the root-form. As a Palatal, **ደ** borders upon **ገ** and **ከ**; at least **ደከቱም** “made an orphan” appears to be connected with **ከኮ**. Compare also **ዐጋም** with **شَام**.

II. MEETING OF LETTERS IN THE SYLLABLE AND IN THE WORD.

GENERAL RULES OF THE SYLLABLE.

§ 33. The two kinds of letters, which have hitherto been exhibited separately, appear in speech only in union with one another. Neither a single vowel nor a single consonant can by itself form a word or constituent part of speech: it is not until they are uttered in combination that words or portions of words are produced. In this combined utterance it is always the vowel which gathers to itself one or several consonants and binds them

Constitution of the Syllable.

(1) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, p. 66, has drawn attention to this fact. Meanwhile, **ሥሐ** “to be small” has its own connection with **ሥሐ**, **ሥሐ**, and **ሥሐ**. The word **ዐጋም** and **ዐጋም**, **طومار** is derived from **τομάριον**.

into one whole. A simple phonetic whole, of this nature, held together by one vowel, constitutes *the Syllable*. Every syllable must have one vowel; but no syllable can have more than one, unless it be two vowels which coalesce in a single vowel-sound or diphthong. One syllable even may by itself have the full force of a word, and thus constitute a word, like **Ṭ** “this”, **ṢḌ** “word”; and Language has a host of monosyllables. By far the greatest number of words, however, contain several of these simple phonetic groups, one of which farther holds the rest round itself as a centre and bears the Tone of the word. Different languages show different dispositions and capabilities in the nature of these simple phonetic groups, according as they severally admit of a larger or a smaller number of consonants being gathered about the one vowel. Semitic languages, generally, do not tolerate the piling up of consonants in one syllable, for they are rich in vowels. Yet there are degrees of difference among them in this respect. Arabic has developed this Semitic tendency with most thoroughness; the Northern-Semitic languages are less rich in vowels; while Ethiopic, in this matter, as in many others, stands midway between these extremes. In particular it resembles Arabic in allowing a short vowel to stand in an open syllable,—that is, in a syllable which ends in a vowel,—independently of its being supported by the Tone; and on the other hand, like the Northern-Semitic languages, it admits long vowels in closed syllables,—that is, syllables which end with a consonant,—and it even allows a word to conclude with a double consonant. Generally, however, open syllables outnumber closed syllables. Farther, Ethiopic evinces a peculiar leaning to the Northern-Semitic tongues, through its very short *ě*-sound, which often takes the place of a full Arabic vowel. The rules of the syllable in detail are as follows⁽¹⁾.

Beginning
of the
Syllable.

§ 34. (1) *Every syllable must begin with a Consonant.* A vowel can never commence a word or syllable, for according to the Semitic conception of phonetic relations, every vowel, however audible in itself, must at least be preceded by a breathing, more or less vigorous. Accordingly in Ethiopic too, all roots which at first began with a vowel have had their initial vowel turned to the

(1) Compare with the following representations KÖNIG, pp. 54sq., 92sq., 104, 118, 189sq., and 143sq.

consistency of a consonant. The same thing is shown in foreign words, whenever they have to be transcribed in Ethiopic: አልፋ *ἄλφα*; ሢሪኔዎስ *Irenaeos*; ሐናንያ *Ἀνανίας*; ዕብራዊ *Ἑβραῖος*; አባሊ or ወባሌ Ex. 30, 13 (*o* being resolved into *au* = *ua* = *wa*) ὀβόλος; ውቅያኖስ *oceanus*; ውለምሕሳ Gen. 28, 19; ይሁዳ Ἰουδαία. It was only the later pronunciation that contrived a pure *u* or *i* in the beginning of the word in cases like ውሉድ, ይገብሩ (§ 19). So when, according to the other rules of formation, two vowels would come together in the middle of a word and thereby bring two syllables into existence (§ 33) in that form, this is not admitted of, and such a hiatus is avoided by contraction or blending into a double or mixed sound (§ 39), or by the interpolation of a separating letter (§ 41), or by the hardening of a vowel into its semivowel (§ 40); and thus the phonetic conditions are reduced to the rule which has been enunciated. It is the same in foreign words, *e. g.* *Theodora* is either transcribed ታኦድራ or ቴዎዶራ.

No syllable begins originally with a double consonant; and in those cases in which the consonant introducing the vowel of the syllable is preceded by a consonant unprovided naturally with a vowel, this consonant is uttered with the shortest vowel *ě*, *e. g.* ግብር *g^e-bár*. But such *ě* is of a fugitive character, being little else than a half-vowel or vowel-touch; and this is one of the cases in which the so-called vowel of the sixth order resembles the Hebrew *sh'va mobile* (§ 22). In the later pronunciation of Ethiopic, however, when the nature of the consonants which came together permitted it,—when, for instance, a liquid followed a mute, or a mute a sibilant,—even that vowel-touch was no longer heard and ፍኖት was pronounced *fnōt*; ብላዕ *blā*; ክረምት *krámt*; and farther even ክልኢ *klē* for *kel'-ē* (§ 47)⁽¹⁾: So in foreign words ስፍንግ *sfeng* for *seféng*, σπόγγος; ክርስቶስ *Chrestós*. Not more than one consonant, however, can be prefixed in this way to the consonant which introduces the vowel of the syllable. When, therefore, by the rules of formation several vowel-less consonants come together before it, an auxiliary vowel must be applied to make it possible to pronounce them. This vowel is generally *ě*, no longer so fugitive as in the foregoing case, but a complete short vowel, *e. g.* ይግብር *yeg-bar*; ትእምርት *tě-mért*.

(¹) LUDOLF, 'Gramm.' I, 5.

Meanwhile foreign words, commencing with three consonants, would often be much disfigured by the insertion of an auxiliary vowel in the group; and in this case a device, current in the other Semitic languages also, was adopted, namely the prefixing of a short vowel introduced by **አ**, to the whole group, *e. g.*, **አስክሬን** *esk'erēn*, *scrinium*. In fact this device for facilitating the pronunciation of vowel-less letters in the beginning of a word is frequently employed, even where only one vowel-less consonant precedes the consonant which introduces the vowel of the syllable. In native words of Ethiopic formation the vowel prefixed is mostly *e*, **አምነ** “out of, from”, from **ምነ**, **ነ**; **አስመ** ⁽¹⁾ “for”, “because”; **አስኩ** (in wish or entreaty) “O that!”; **አብሬት** “vicissitude”, from **በረዩ**; **አግዚአ** “Lord”, for **ግዚአ**; perhaps **አልታኅ** “under-garment” and **አምሐው** “ancestor”; (on **አንግዳ** “foreigner”, *v.* § 137 *ad fin.*). In Ethiopic words of earlier formation the vowel *a* is also used, **አጽባዕት** “finger”, **أَصْبَع**. In foreign words *ä* appears more frequently than *ě*, particularly in those which have reached Abyssinia through the Arabic: **አስጢፋኖስ** *Stephanus*; **አክሊሚንቶስ** with the older **ቅሌምንጦስ** *Clemens*; **አትሮንስ** *Ἰρόνος*; **አስኬማ** *σχημα*; **አስፋራድ** *σπυρίδα*; **አብሮቅላ** *Procla*; **አብረክሲስ** *πράξις* (Arab.).

Termination of the Syllable.

§ 35. (2) *The syllable may terminate either in a vowel or a consonant.* If it terminates in a vowel, the vowel may be either long or short: **ዝ zé**; **ኀባ hāba**; **ፈጸመ fáṣṣama**; **ቆመ qōma**; **ሜጡ mēṭū**. If it closes with a consonant, the vowel of the syllable may be short, as in **ገበርኩ gabárkū**; **ገበርከሙ gabárkémmū**, or long, whether it has the tone, as is usually the case—**አምላክ amlāk**; **አሙንቱ emüntū** ⁽²⁾; **ኖምካ nómka**; **ታምልክ tāmlek**—or has not the tone, *e. g.* **ሜጥከሙ mēṭkémū**; **ደሚጥውዎ ደፌጽ ሞሙ** &c.

A syllable may end even in two consonants, but only in the termination of a word. Cases like **አንትኩ** “that” (*fem.*) are no

(1) In the later pronunciation this **አ** is again rejected: the pronunciation is *sma*, *sku*, and so too **አስከ** “till” (which has had a different origin) *ska*, LUDOLF I, 5.

(2) [But *v.* PRAETORIUS, ‘*Aethiop. Gramm.*’, p. 23, where—following TRUMPF, p. 548—he puts the tone on the last syllable:—*ēmüntú*. TR.]

exceptions, for, even granted that it was pronounced *ént-kū*, and not rather *ént^ekū* ⁽¹⁾, this word must be regarded as a compound of two words, and must be estimated in the same way as ሞንትኑ “what?”; መንግሥትኒ “the kingdom also” &c. It is mainly in feminine Nominal stems formed by the closely attached *t*, that a double consonant occurs in the end of a word. The vowel of such a syllable, owing to its being more compressed by the two closing consonants, must of necessity be short; and thus if it was originally a long vowel, it must be shortened: ፍቲርት *fetért*; ትምህርት *temhért*; ከዋክብት *kawākebt*; ጸሐርት *ṣahárt*; አሕቅልት *aḥqélt*. It is only when the first of the two final consonants is a Semi-vowel or an Aspirate-Guttural, that the vowel of the syllable may be long (v. § 36). There are, besides, other cases, in which a word ends in two vowel-less consonants (v. § 38).

CHANGES OF LETTERS CONSEQUENT ON THE GENERAL RULES OF THE SYLLABLE, OR ON THEIR MEETING WITH OTHER LETTERS.

1. VOWELS.

§ 36. In Ethiopic, as well as in all other Semitic languages, the vowels are the letters most subject to alteration, as forming the more mobile and subtle division of the sounds of speech. And yet this change among them is far from being carried out here as extensively as in Hebrew (§ 22): it is only in a few directions that a comparatively frequent exchange of vowels prevails.

Shortening
of Long
Vowels.
Lengthen-
ing of Short
Vowels.

(A) INFLUENCE OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE SYLLABLE AND THE WORD ON THE VOWELS.

The most important phenomena in this reference are *the Shortening of Long Vowels and the Lengthening of Short Vowels*. It is true that, in accordance with § 35, Ethiopic may admit both long and short vowels in open as well as in closed syllables, and

⁽¹⁾ [TRUMPP, p. 547, transcribes this word in the form *entekú*; PRAETORIUS, ‘*Aethiop. Gramm.*’ p. 28, follows TRUMPP, writing the word thus:—*ëntekú*. TR.]

that too, whether they have or have not the tone, the result being that exchange between long and short vowels is by no means carried so far in this language as it is in others. But still there are several cases in which this change occurs. In a syllable ending in two consonants a long vowel is not admitted (§ 35). Thus when a second vowel-less consonant⁽¹⁾ is appended to an ordinary closed syllable, *ā* must be *shortened* to *ǎ*, and *ū* and *ī* to *ě*. Accordingly **ወያጥ** “dealer” forms in the Fem. **ወየጥ** (for **ወየጥት** § 54); **ሠላስ**, **ሰማኒ**, in the Fem. **ሠለስት**, **ሰመንት**; the very common form **ግብር** becomes in the Fem. **ግብርት** *gebért*; and it is only from **ርኩስ** “unclean”, and the like, that **ርኩስት** even is read in place of **ርኩስት** (§ 42)⁽²⁾; **እግዚእ** and **ልሂቅ** in the Fem. have the forms **እግዝእት** and **ልሀቅት**. A syllable of this kind may retain *ā*, only when the first of the two concluding consonants is an Aspirate: in such a case, if it has a short *a*, the vowel must be lengthened, *e. g.* **ነዋላት**, **ቂንዛእት** (§ 46); but any long vowels, other than *ā*, must be shortened even before Aspirates, *e. g.* **ብፁዕ** Fem. **ብፅዕት**; and yet here and there one meets also with **እግዚእት** and even with **ሊቅት** (from **ሊቅ**, inasmuch as **ቀ** occasionally shares in the peculiarities of the Aspirates). Farther, when the first of the two concluding consonants is a semi-vowel, the long vowel may be retained:—thus not only does one say **ሠናይት**, **ማእከላይት**,—for here **ይ** has the sound of *i*,—but also **ሕያውት**, **እምሔውት**, where the **ው** inclines at least to *u* (§ 39). Apart from the very common case which has been described, the shortening of a long vowel in the formation only occurs regularly, when the tone-less *ī* of the Fem.-persons of the verb is brought into the middle of the word, through the attachment of a suffix. Shortening happens also under the influence of a **የ** or a **ወ**, which draws to itself a *y* or a *w* out of a foregoing or following *ī* or *ū*, and leaves the vowel reduced to a short *ě* (§ 52); or it may happen in consequence of the emphasis of the word, an *ō*, or an *ā* which has come from *ō*, being in certain cases simplified into *ū*, and an *ē* into *ī* (§ 60). Cases

(1) A short *ě* originally ending the Noun (whereon v. § 38) is not taken into account here.

(2) An exception is formed also by **ንዑልት** ‘*Kufāle*’, p. 142, l. 3.—On forms like **አዘዝኒ** = **አዘዝኪ** + **ኒ** v. *infra*, § 151, 4. [As regards **ርኩስት**, when it does occur, it is probably an instance merely of caco-graphy for **ርኩስት** in an inferior MS.]

fall to be noticed here also, in which *ū* occasionally becomes *uě*, just as **ዝኩ** and **አከኩ** *zékū, élkū*, with the addition of **ቱ**, are, by reason of this new load in the end of the word, shortened to **ዝኩቱ** and **አከኩቱ** and even to **ዝከቱ** and **አከቱ** (v. § 26).—It is only under the influence of an Aspirate coming after it, that a *short vowel is lengthened* in the formation with a measure of regularity, and even then the rule is restricted to *a* and *e* (§ 46). For other cases, in which short *ă* or *ě* becomes *ā, ī, or ū*, or even *ě* becomes *ē*,—see above, §§ 18, 20, 21. Besides, when we make a comparison with other Semitic languages, we are obliged to recognise in the *ā, ī, and ū* of certain Word-forms, vowels which were originally short, and which, merely through the tone, have been gradually turned into long vowels (v. *infra*).

The *weakening and reducing of vowels* occur occasionally in a few words, in particular in the weakening of *a* into *ě* (§ 18), the reduction of *ū* to *ō*, and of *ī* on the one hand and *ā* on the other to *ē* (§ 21), and the simplification of *ō* to *ā* (§ 18). A regular phenomenon in Formation is the reduction of *ă* to *ě* before Aspirates (§ 45), as well as the reduction, and at the same time the lengthening, of *ă* into *ē*, the lengthening being by way of compensation for a double consonant (§ 56).

Weakening
and re-
ducing of
Vowels.

§ 37. Individual vowels may *fall away*, but only when they meet with other vowels (§ 41). On the other hand this fate is very often experienced by Short *ě* as a result of change in the conditions of the syllable. In many forms it is not maintained either by the tone or by a closed syllable, and already sounds very short and little else than a half-vowel; and thus upon due occasion it disappears completely. The following cases fall to be noticed here in detail:—(a) A short *ě* in an open syllable without the tone, which is preceded by another open syllable having a long or short vowel, can seldom maintain itself, at least according to the later pronunciation: it brings about the attachment of its own introductory consonant to the preceding syllable and then disappears: thus **ዩገብሩ** (originally *yegaberū*) is given as *yegabrū*; **ዩጸከፋ** (orig. *yeseḥfū*) as *yeseḥfū*; **ዩባርኩ** *yebārku*: **ዩፌጽሙ** *yefēšmū*; **ሞድራውያን** *medrāwyān*; and so in the semi-passive expression of the verb, instead of original **ገብረ** *gābera*, **ተገብረ** *tagābera*, the pronunciation is rather *gābra* and *tagābra*. But the *ě* which constitutes the so-called Binding-vowel of the pronom-

Treatment
of Short *ě*,
under
change of
Syllabic
Conditions.

inal suffixes is retained, whether with or without the tone, even in the later pronunciation, thus: አምላክን *amlākēna*; ቃልክ *qāleka*. Again, this shorter pronunciation is not employed, if the open syllable which precedes the syllable containing *ě* is a particle externally prefixed, such as a preposition or conjunction, *e. g.*:—በስታይ *ba-setāi* (not *bastāi*); ለትቁም *la-teqūm* (not *latqūm*); but it appears in special and permanent compounds, like እግዚአብሔር *egziabḥēr*, ገነቱ *zēktū*. (b) A short *ě* in a closed syllable, which is preceded by an open syllable, is maintained more firmly,—so that ያገብር, ያመልክ, ንግር are rendered *yegáber*, *yāmálek*, *neger*. It is the same with ደናግል *danāgel* and አዋልድ *awāled*; and only a slovenly pronunciation would give these words as *awāld* and *yāmalk*. But when a formative syllable, beginning with a vowel, is applied to such a closed syllable containing *ě*, the final consonant of the latter is taken over to the formative syllable, and the *e*,—left with its introductory consonant,—disappears, while the last-named consonant attaches itself to the foregoing syllable: ያገብሩ, ያመልክ, ንግሪ *negrī*; ደናግል *danāgla* (although at first certainly *danāgela*); ደግን, ደግኑ *dēgen*, but *dēgnū*.

Treatment
of Short *ě*
at the end
of Nominal
Stems.

§ 38. A similar loss of a short and fugitive *ě* has been experienced by Ethiopic at the end of Nominal stems. It may be proved pretty clearly, from the formation of individual Nominal stems, singular and plural, as well as from some other indications, leaving in fact no room for doubt, that at one time Ethiopic had the *ground-form* of Nominal stems, as distinguished from the Construct state and the Accusative, *ending in a fugitive ě*⁽¹⁾, so that at one time, for instance, ገብር “servant” was pronounced

(¹) Just as a noun in Arabic ends in *u* in the Nominative and in *i* in the Genitive. In Ethiopic these two cases had not yet been distinguished. The above theory,—which has been contested by TRUMPP, p. 532, but has been supported by KÖNIG, p. 76sq.,—I have endeavoured to establish in my Essay (‘Observations on the Grammar of Ge’ez and on the ancient History of Abyssinia’): ‘*Bemerkungen [zur Grammatik des Geez und zur alten Geschichte Abessinians: Sitzber. d. K. Pr. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Berlin]* 1890, p. 3sqg. On the Arabic literary language, which knows nothing of nouns ending in a consonant, *cf.* FLEISCHER, ‘*Beiträge*’, *St.* 2. p. 281sqg.; *St.* 5. p. 130sqg., and on the form of the Himyaric local name ظفار, WÜSTENFELD, ‘*al Bakrī II*, p. 468; ‘*Jāqūt III*, p. 576; *cf.* OLSEHAUSEN, ‘*Monatsber. d. K. Preuss. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Berlin* 1881’, p. 690.

gábr^e, and **ደናግል** *danāgel^e*. This termination in a vowel must, however, have worn itself off in very early times,—a thing which in the case of most of the Nominal stems might well have happened without increasing the difficulty of pronunciation, particularly when the second-last consonant had a vowel of its own, however short, like **ነገድ**, **ዐራዝ**, **ደናግል** and others. Even when the second-last consonant had no vowel, the vowel-termination of the word would be discarded without difficulty, if the two consonants, thus deprived of vowels, were of such a kind that they could be readily attached to each other,—if, for instance, the last consonant were a Mute or a Sibilant, as in **መርግ**, **ረምስ**, **ግምድ**, **ከርሥ**, or if the second-last were a soft Aspirate as in **ዝእብ** &c. In such cases, owing to the new pronunciation, a host of words arose, ending in a double consonant (v. § 35), and given thus, *mārg*, *rāms* &c. But in other cases, the loss of final *ě* left as a result groups of consonants not so easily attached to each other, like **ገብር**, **ጎፋን**, **ቁጽል**, **ዐቅም** &c. If, nevertheless, final *ě* was given up in such instances, as—according to descriptions of Ethiopic pronunciation—seems to have been the case, then of necessity a fugitive *ě* must have been brought in after the second-last consonant,—thus, *gáb^er*, *héf^en*⁽¹⁾ &c. There are, however, a number of Nominal forms, in which final *ě* did not allow itself to be so easily dislodged, but probably continued to be spoken even in later times. *In the first place*, when a word ended in a *u*-containing guttural, the *ě* connected with that *u* was bound to maintain its position more tenaciously: for instance, **ኅልቀ**, **አዕናቀ** were certainly not pronounced bare *huélq* and *a'nāq*⁽²⁾, but *huélquě*, *a'nāquě*, so that in pronunciation alone there is no difference between **እጎው** and **እኅ** “brother”⁽³⁾. *In the second place*, when the concluding consonant of the Nominal forms concerned here is a semivowel, as in **በድው**, **ሥርው**, **ቃጎው**, **ራእይ**, **አሕርው**, **ሰዋስው**, **መኃትው**, **ወላትው**, **ግማዕይ**, the final *ě* must always be

(1) Accordingly words, which originally resembled Arabic words like **مَلِك**, came rather to resemble Hebrew words after the type of **מֶלֶךְ**.

(2) If even the single word **ዐንጉት** was pronounced *ānguag*, as LUDOLF says; for it is also written **ዐንጉግ**.

(3) How KÖNIG (pp. 76, 140) could dispute this position, it is impossible to perceive.

retained, to prevent the resolution of the semivowel into the vowel, thus *bádw^e*, *šérw^e*, *qāḥw^e*, *rā'y^e*, *āḥrew^e*, and *sawāsw^e*, *ma-ḥātw^e*, *walātw^e*, *gamā'y^e*, for original *sawāsew^e* &c., the fugitive *ě* of the second-last syllable being given up, and its introductory consonant being attached to the preceding open syllable (v. *supra*). At least **ወ** is always maintained in this way as a semivowel, unless preceded by *ä*. **የ** is less stable; and in certain words and forms,—which will be specially indicated farther on, in the account of Nominal formation,—it passes into *ī*, e. g.: **መከልይ** and **መከሊ**; i. e. *makāley^e* becomes either *makāly^e* or *makāley* = *makālī*, just as, for instance, the form mentioned above, **ረእይ**, may easily be pronounced *rā'ī* in place of *rā'y^e*. But in other Nominal forms also, like **ሀልወ** (from **ሀለወ**), **ሕያወ**, **ጠረወ**, final *ě* is maintained in the very same way, and the transition of the semivowel into a vowel is prevented (v., farther, on this matter § 51 sq.; cf. also some of the names of the letters discussed in § 9). *Thirdly*, the retention of final *ě* is generally necessary, when the last consonant is one of the five Aspirates,—particularly in forms like **ነቅዕ**, **ነቅሀ**, **ቅብእ**, **ዙብእ**, where the aspirate is inaudible without a vowel before or after it, and where the pronunciation *nāqē'* &c. is likewise difficult. In such forms the preferable pronunciation is *nāq^e*, *nāqh^e*, *qēb^e*, *kuēsh^e*, resembling the Accusative **ነቅሀ** and the Feminine **ንቅሀት**. But even forms like **ኃጥእ**, **አባገዕ**,—although the pronunciation *hāṭe'*, *abāge'*, has a foundation in the formation,—should rather be pronounced *hāṭ^e*, *abāg^e* with retention of the original final sound, by reason of the attractive force of the *ā* upon the consonant which follows it and the consequent complete disappearance of the fugitive *e* which came after that consonant. In fact, in all the Nominal forms ending in Aspirates, in which a vowel, different from *a*, *ā* or *ě*, comes immediately before the Aspirate, like **ነዊእ**, **ግብእ**, this final *ě*, it seems, must be heard, if the Aspirate is not to lose all its force (as in the Amharic pronunciation of Ethiopic):—thus we say *nawīh^e*, *gebū^e* (¹).

The scanty observations made by the earlier grammarians on the pronunciation of Ethiopic among the natives in their day, are far from being sufficient to enable us to settle all its details with exactness. The leading rules, meanwhile, are the result of

(¹) Just as little can one say in Hebrew **נחלש** or **נחלש**.

observing the modes of formation and the historical development of the pronunciation in general. The fact that no longer was anything heard of final *ē* in the Noun, in those very recent times when the pronunciation of Aspirates and Vowels was in full process of decay, does not justify the conclusion that it never existed; and we shall do well to re-introduce it even, in the course of learning Ethiopic, if we recognise that it has a historical foundation. The entire development of the later pronunciation tended to impoverish, and not to enrich, the language in the matter of vowels, as may be gathered both from §§ 37, 38, and from the similar case noted in § 34.

(B) MEETING OF VOWELS.

§ 39. The general rule, that no syllable can begin with a vowel (§ 34), implies that if two vowels come directly upon one another in the formative process, they cannot stand side by side as two separate sounds: the hiatus thus constituted must be remedied somehow. The means for this purpose at the command of the language are the following.

Contraction
and
Coalescing.

(1) *Contraction and Coalescing.* Two vowel-sounds meeting together pass readily, in certain circumstances, into one sound, simple or composite, so that they form only one syllable.

(a) If two like vowels, long or short, come directly upon one another, then the pairs $\bar{i} + \bar{i}$, $\bar{u} + \bar{u}$ are not indeed contracted into \bar{i} and \bar{u} , but one vowel in such a pair has to be hardened into a semivowel (§ 52): on the other hand the pair $a + a$ is very frequently and regularly contracted into \bar{a} , e. g. in **ሐዋርያ** + **ፈተ** (Plur.), **ሐዋርያት**; **ዕንዚራ** + a (of the Cstr. st.), **ዕንዚራ**; **ገብረ** + \bar{a} (for $h\bar{a}$ Suff.), **ገብረ**; **ዕሥራ** + $\bar{a}w\bar{i}$, **ዕሥራዊ**. Two independent words even, viz. **እመ** “if” and **እኮ** “not”, blend into **እማክኮ**. Similarly, $\bar{e} + a$ and $\bar{o} + a$,—for example in the Accusative form of Nominal stems ending in \bar{e} and \bar{o} ,—become \bar{e} and \bar{o} , while, in other cases of this kind, \bar{e} and \bar{o} are resolved into their component parts, or else are separated from the following dissimilar vowel by a disjoining letter.

(b) When unlike vowels meet together, then if they are such as to be capable of blending into one combined sound, they pass into such a sound. An i is in this way easily attached to a foregoing \bar{a} , \bar{u} or \bar{o} , e. g. **ያደድዕ** “he shall make known”; **ብካይ** “the

weeping”; **ብዕራይ** “cattle”; **ተዓይን** “camp”; **እኩይ** “bad”; **ሰኑይ** ⁽¹⁾ “the second”; **ሆይ** ‘name of a letter of the alphabet’; and yet in this case the combination must continue rather external in character, and *āi* or *āy*, for instance, is not allowed to become *ē* ⁽²⁾. On the other hand *u* is much less easily attached to *ā* or *ē*, and accordingly it is better to render it hard, after both of them, as a semivowel, *āw*, *ēw*:—**ያውርድ** *yāwred* “(that) he bring down”; **ንቃው** *neqāw* “tone”; **ጠረው** *tarāw* “Pleiades”; **ዴው** *ṣēw* “salt”; **እምሔው** *emhēw* “ancestor”. LUDOLF, it is true, says that in his time **ዴው** was pronounced *ṣēu* ⁽³⁾, and *Europa* is now written **ኤውሮፓ**, but no conclusion for the original pronunciation follows therefrom. In more ancient times a *eu*, for instance in *εὐαγγέλιον*, *Eulogia*, *Eustathius*, was expressed quite differently; and in the formation of certain Nominal stems it is farther shown very clearly how little *āw* can ever be contracted into *āu* and *ō*. On the other hand *ā* + *i* and *ā* + *u* regularly coalesce into *ai* and *au*, or in many cases blend still farther directly into *ē* and *ō*. In this matter too it is characteristic of Ethiopic that it differs from Arabic and approaches Hebrew. The *mixed sound* *ē* or *ō* appears throughout in the Perfect of Triliteral verbs *mediae infirmae*, like **ሢመ** and **ቆመ** (unless special phonetic conditions had of necessity to introduce the diphthongal pronunciation, § 94), also in all the forms of those Quadriliteral Verbs which have *i* or *u* as second radical, such as **ሌለዩ**, **ቶስሐ**,—in Nominal stems from roots *tertiæ* **ወ** and **የ**, which end in the Feminine *t*,—and in the Suffix pronoun of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. attached to the Accusative of the Noun. The *diphthong*, on the other hand, is maintained most regularly in several forms from roots *primæ vocalis*, like **አውሀበ**, **ተውሳከ**, **አይበሰ** &c.,—in the Subjunctive of verbs *tertiæ* **የ**,—and in the plural forms ending in **ውት** and **ይት** of Nominal stems, *e. g.* **ነዐውት** ⁽⁴⁾, **ዐበይት**, manifestly because the *a*-sound is of essential importance in these forms ⁽⁵⁾,—and, lastly, in the interior

(¹) These forms, however, ought properly to be given as *bekāy*, *ekūy*, *ta'āyen* or *ta'āyen* (§ 38).

(²) To be sure, the form **ሠኔት** for **ሠናይት** is met with.

(³) [*Cf.* TRUMPF, p. 519sq.]

(⁴) Yet **ኖሎት**, **ገኖት**.

(⁵) At the same time distinguishing them from the forms of the Feminine Singular.

of the word, in all those forms in which a diphthong *ai* or *au* has sprung from an original *āye* or *āwe* just through briefer pronunciation (§ 37), *e. g.* **ደመደጠ**, **ደቀውሙ**. But in all other Nominal formations and in the conjugation of verbs *tertiæ infirmæ*, and of those which end in *u* in the Subjunctive, as well as in some few individual words, the speech fluctuates between the diphthong and the mixed sound, varying with roots, with the age, with authors, with copyists; and the very same word frequently appears under both modes of pronunciation. A comprehensive survey, however, proves that as time went on, the mixed form of pronunciation steadily gained ground, and only a few departments of the language remained unaffected by it. In foreign words also, *au* and *ai* are generally expressed by *ō* and *ē* (*ī*), although the reverse process is also met with, in the substitution of *au* for the *ō* of the foreign word, as in **የውጣ** *lōṭa*. Besides, the mixed sound *ē* or *ō* may arise not merely from *ai* or *au*, but also and frequently from *ia* or *ua* (v. *infra* § 40). When *i* is preceded by *ē*, it can only dissolve into the diphthong *ei*, *e. g.* **ሐይወት** *heiwat*⁽¹⁾, although this is of rare occurrence. When *u* follows *ē*, it must be changed into *w* (v. § 49 *sqq.*).

§ 40. (2) *Hardening of the Vowel into a Semivowel*. This process can take place only with those vowels which have corresponding semivowels, that is with *i* and *u*, or with the mixed vowels *ē* and *ō*, by resolving them into their elements. In the beginning of a word *i* and *u* must always be hardened in this way, seeing that no word can begin with a vowel (§ 34), *e. g.*, **ውእቱ** (*wē-’ētū*) for *uetū*; **ይእቱ** (*yē-’ētū*) for *ietū*. All roots therefore which originally began with *i* or *u* have been hardened into roots *primæ* **የ** and **ወ**. And since *u* cannot have the sound of a vowel after *ā* or *ē* (§ 39), it must always be hardened, when it closes a syllable after those vowels:—**ያውርድ** *yāwred*; **ይውግዑ** *yewge’ū*. The same thing happens after *ī*, *e. g.* **ተላው**. So too *i* is hardened after *ī*, and *u* after *ū* (v. § 39 and *infra*, § 52). In the interior of a word *ī* and *ū* must become **ይ** and **ወ** whenever either of them happens to come between two syllables, of which the last begins with a vowel of any kind, though the first may be

Hardening
of Vowel
into Semi-
vowel.

⁽¹⁾ In Cod. B. of Sirach (PETERM. II, ‘*Nachtr.*’ 55) **ሐይወት** is from time to time written instead of **ሐይወት**.

either an open or a closed syllable. Thus before the vowel *ē*: **ይመይጥ**, **ይቀውጥ** *yemáyet*, *yeqáwem*, from *yema-i-et*, *yega-u-em*; **ተግይን** *ta'āyen*⁽¹⁾; **ወሓይዝት** from **ውሓዝ**; **ሥርው** *šéru*^e out of *šéru*^e; before *ā*, e. g. **ማርዩ** from **ማሪ**; **ትልወኒ** from **ትሉ**; before *ā*, **ይበልያ** from **ይበሊ**; **ይዜምዋ** from **ይዜሙ**; **ሰማያውያን** from **ሰማያዊ**; before *ī*, **ትበልዩ** from **ትበሊ**; **መዊት** for *ma-ū-ūt*; before *ū*, **ይበልዩ** from **ይበሊ**; **ይዜምወ** from **ይዜሙ**; before *ō*, **ይሬአዮሙ** from **ይሬአ**; **ይተልዎሙ** from **ይተሉ**; before *ē*, e. g. **ሕሳዌ**. This hardening is necessary before all vowels except *ǎ*⁽²⁾: On the other hand in particular forms, it is true, *ī* or *ū* before *ǎ* passes of necessity into *ya* or *wa*. However, in several other forms the *a*-sound may press into these, and thus coalesce with them into a mixed sound, *ia* and *ua* becoming *ai* and *au* and farther *ē* and *ō*. Most regularly the Nominal termination corresponding to the Arabic **عِيَّة** is in this way shortened into *ēt* and *ē*, e. g. **ረድኤት** “help”; **ምሳሌ** “parable”⁽³⁾; and the Accusative and Construct state of many nouns in *ī* have *ē* instead of *ya*, e. g. **ብእሲ**, **ብእሴ**. In the same way the binding-letter *ē* between several nouns and the suffix pronouns has come from *ia* (§ 167), e. g. **ማእከሌኑ**. In other formations also, *ya* and *wa* are exchanged at pleasure for *ē* and *ō*, thus **ቅንዩት** and **ቅኒት** “service”; **ፍትወት** and **ፍቶት** “desire”; while others again admit of the contracted form only, like **ፍኖት** “way”; **ጸሎት** “prayer”; **ምሌት** “evening” &c.

In like manner the mixed letters *ō* and *ē*, although in certain cases they absorb a following *ǎ* (§ 39), must as a rule be resolved into *aw* and *ay* before a vowel placed immediately after them, of whatever sort it be, e. g. **ይሕዮ** “(that) he live” (= **ይሕየው**), **ትሕየዊ**, **ይሕየወ**, **ይሕየዋ** &c.; **ገበ** “side”, in plural **ገበዋት**. On the other hand an *ē*, originating in *ia*, is readily resolved into *ya*, e. g. **ምሳሌ** + *āt*, **ምሳልያት**.

Meanwhile *ī*, *ū* and *ē* do not necessarily pass into pure *y*, *w* and *ay*, but may keep their place before *y* and *w*:— thus in-

(1) These words may farther of course, by shorter pronunciation, in accordance with § 36, be turned into *yemait*, *yegaum*, *ta'āin*.

(2) V., however, *infra* § 49 *sqq.*

(3) This law, accepted also by SCHRADER, ‘*De linguae Aethiopicae indole &c.*’ (Gott. 1860), p. 11, is disputed by KÖNIG, p. 112 *sq.*, without my being able to agree with his own explanation. Cf. also PRAETORIUS, ‘*Aethiop. Gramm.*’ p. 22.

stead of **ገበርከም**, **ገበርከሙ** is also met with, from **ገበርከሙ**; or **አወሬዮ** Deut. 22, 1. This occurs most frequently and most regularly with nouns in *ē*, when they form an external plural, as in **ጽጌ** “flower”, **ጽጌያት**; **ከንኔ** “judgment”, **ከንኔያት**, and when to the suffix pronoun **ኒ** another is attached beginning with a vowel, *e. g.* **ሀበኒያ** “give her to me”, from **ሀበኒ** and *ā* (= **ሃ**): V. farther § 52.—We call this the “Semi-hardening”.

In foreign words which contain two vowels, the one immediately following the other, the hiatus is obviated, wherever possible, by a like complete or partial hardening of one of them, as in **ማርያም** *Μαριάμ*; **ፊደያ** *Lydia*; **ኢየሱስ** *Ἰησοῦς*; **ጳውላውስ** *Leontius*.

§ 41. (3) *Interpolation of a Separating Consonant.* This means of avoiding the hiatus is upon the whole seldom employed⁽¹⁾. The readiest method in such a case (as in a similar one, § 34) is to insert an **አ** or some still stronger Aspirate, *e. g.* **ነኳ** “behold!” formed from **ነ** and an appended *ā*; yet an Aspirate as a separating letter is hardly met with except in foreign words, *e. g.* **ታኦዶስዮስ** *Theodosius*, and even **ሰሌሞ** *Σιλωάμ*. In true Ethiopic forms, however, the Aspirate (which in other cases also—§ 48—may pass into a Semivowel) inclines to become at once a Semivowel; and the more indeterminate **ው** is in greater favour in this usage than the pointed **ደ**. This insertion of a separating **ው**⁽²⁾ is most usual in Inner Plural forms: **በሐውርት** “lands” from **በሐር**; **ሊቃውንት** “eldership”⁽³⁾ from **ሊቃን**. The Adjective-ending *āwī* appears also to have come from *āi* in this way, *e. g.* **ቀዳማዊ** alongside of **ቀዳማይ**; and to the particle **ነ** “behold!” the suffix pronouns are attached partly by means of **ው**, *e. g.* **ነዋ**, partly and still more frequently by means of **የ**, *e. g.* **ነያ**, **ነዮሙ**, § 160. On the other hand, cases like **ጽጌ** “flower”, Pl. **ጽጌያት**, are to be explained according to § 40. The insertion of a separating Semivowel comes also into use in transcribing foreign words into Ethiopic: **ቴዎድራ** *Theodora*, a secondary form of **ታኦድራ**; **ቴዎሎግና** “Theology”, a secondary form of **ቴሎግና** or **ቶሎግና** &c.⁽⁴⁾

Interpolation of Separating Consonant.

(1) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 126 *sqq.*

(2) Cf. EWALD, ‘Gramm. Arab.’ § 50, and ‘Hebr. Sprachlehre’ § 28, *d.*

(3) [V. § 140, *a*, where it is explained that this word,—properly a plural, meaning ‘seniors’,—has become a collective form, which is used as an official denomination. *TR.*]

(4) KÖNIG differs from me, p. 129. — D’ABBADIE, ‘Catal. rais.’, p. 127;

Displacing
of one Vowel
by another.

(4) *The displacing of one vowel by another* also occurs but rarely. Naturally this can only affect short vowels. The fugitive *ě* at the end of Nouns disappears before the Binding-vowel *ě* or *ī* of the suffix pronoun, e. g. **ገብር**, **ገብርየ**, **ሥርወ**, **ሥርወኩ**. In the Subjunctive formation of roots *mediae vocalis* an *ě* or *ā* is absorbed by *ū* and *ī*, e. g. **ይቁም** for *yequēm* or *yequām*; **ይሚጥ** for *yemiet*: for other similar cases v. § 49 *ad fin.*, § 51 and § 53. Also, in the accusative of the Noun, e. g. in **ወርቀ**, *ā* before the suffix pronoun **የ** (§ 154) is dislodged by *ě* (*ī*): **ወርቅየ** *wargéya*. For several other cases, in which *u*, *w* or *i*, *y* disappear completely, v. § 52. In the transcription of foreign words into Ethiopic, the absorption of one of two vowels which come directly together is of more frequent occurrence: for examples v. *supra*, and in § 20.

Meeting of
the *u* of
U-Contain-
ing Guttur-
als with cer-
tain Vowels.

§ 42. *The meeting of the u of u-containing Gutturals with certain vowels* deserves special notice. This *u*, in fact, by becoming hardened into a kind of consonant, may easily permit of an unlike vowel being heard after it, without its own proper character being thereby impaired: the principal vowel may be heard in *quā*, *quě*, *quī*, *quā*, or *quē*, clearly distinguished from the *u*-sound. Whenever then, in the course of framing words and forms, one of the five named vowels should properly appear after a *u*-containing Guttural, this may take place without farther difficulty; and these vowels are treated in such a case with the very same regularity as if they followed the ordinary consonants. Thus we form, for instance, **ገብረ** “he has numbered”; **ገብረ** “they have numbered” (Fem.); **ትንልቀ** “thou numberest” (Fem.); **ይንልቀ** “he numbers”; **ጉለቋ** “enumeration”. At the same time it is evident that such a guttural can never be completely mute, but a fugitive *ě* must always be heard after it, to make its own *u*-sound audible, even in cases where the corresponding forms of ordinary roots have a vowel-less consonant. This *ě* is found both in the end of the word, e. g. in **ይንልቀ** *yehwēleque* (of the form **ይፈጽም** *yefēšem*), —as well as in the Noun § 38—, and in the interior of the word, as in **ደጉር** *déguer*; **ሐጉል** *hāguel*; **ኩዝክ** *kuákueh*. Only in a few words is the *u*-sound readily given up completely in such a

‘*Géographie*’ I, p. 12 (*Préface*), shows how at this day in Abyssinia **ው** and **ይ** are pronounced between two vowels, in words like **ዳዩር**, **ጊዮርጊስ**, **ሰረዬ**.

case: **ገከቱ** and **አልከቱ** (§ 26); **ዐንጉጉ** and **ዐንጉግ** “lizard”⁽¹⁾. On the other hand whenever such *u*-containing gutturals have to take up a *ū* or an *ō*, the *u*-sound of the guttural regularly coalesces with this *ū* or *ō*, so that *hualaqu-ū*, *hualaqu-ōmū* are given as **ኅለቂ**, **ኅለቂሙ**, and from **ጉጉአ** we have **ጉጉእ**, after the form **ግቡር** &c. As soon, however, as such a *ū* falls to be hardened into a semivowel, by reason of the application of affixes beginning with a vowel, the *u*-containing pronunciation of the guttural reappears, *e. g.* **ኅለቂ** with the pron. suff. becomes **ኅለቂዎሙ** *hualaquewōmū*.

Still, the vowels of these *u*-containing gutturals are always somewhat heavier and weightier than the corresponding vowels of simple consonants. This explains why, in such words, originally short vowels are readily lengthened, so that, for instance, the verb **ነቂረ** “to be one-eyed” is even met with in one case written **ነቂረ**. Farther, *ū* approaches *uě* pretty closely, and *ō*, *uă*; and therefore an original *uě* or *uă* passes easily into *ū* or *ō*, *e. g.* **ቀሱል** into **ቁሱል**; **ርኩሱት** into **ርኩሱት**; **ሰኩት** “street” into **ሰኩት**; **ተሰቂቀዎ** into **ተሰቂቀዎ**; **ኅለቂ** into **ኅለቂ**⁽²⁾. In like manner original *ū* or *ō* passes into *uě* or *uă*, *e. g.* **ከን** “be (thou)” into **ከን** &c. (§ 26); **አስቂረረ** into **አስቂረረ** &c. In the more accurate manuscripts an interchange of this nature is not observable.

(C) MEETING OF VOWELS AND CONSONANTS AND THEIR INTERCHANGES.

(α) INFLUENCE OF ASPIRATES ON THE VOWELS.

§ 43. Among the Consonants, the Aspirates and Semivowels stand nearest the Vowels; and this relationship of theirs to the Vowels brings about manifold vowel-changes.

Close relation of Vowels and Aspirates.

The Aspirates stand in a peculiarly close relation to the vowels, from the circumstance that on the one hand the vowel, —generally *a*—, always involves a breathing, which is distinctly audible even when the vowel begins or ends a word independently, and that on the other hand the breathing cannot be heard, except it have a vowel before or after it. This reciprocal relation of vow-

⁽¹⁾ In the case of other words, this often rests upon errors of copyists.

⁽²⁾ [Thus throughout in the old *Cod. P* of the *Kebra Nag.*; v. the Glossary.]

els and aspirates settles their power to effect changes in one another. In languages rich in vowels, like Arabic, or poor in vowels like Syriac, such an influence has asserted itself less decidedly, but in Ethiopic and in Hebrew it has become most thoroughgoing and multifarious. Besides, certain phenomena, which are met with in Hebrew in the case of the softer and weaker aspirates only, have become comparatively common in Ethiopic,—even with gutturals which were formerly stronger—, in consequence of the gradual softening which at an early date crept into the pronunciation of the harder aspirates (§ 24).

Aspirate
must have
a Vowel
directly
next it.

(1) *The Aspirate must always have a Vowel directly next it, whether before or after it.* Accordingly, neither in the beginning of a word, when an Aspirate makes its appearance merely as a consonant prefixed to a full syllable, nor in the termination of the Noun, when a guttural follows a vowel-less consonant, could the shorter pronunciation described in §§ 34 and 38 occur; but on the contrary **ሕደ** or **ኀር** had always to be pronounced *heṣē*, *heṣār*, and **ኀቐ** “a fountain” and the like, *náq^e*. Even with Nominal stems which end in aspirates, it is better to retain a final *ě* there too, when any other vowel than *a*, *ā* or *ě* immediately precedes the Aspirate, as has been already pointed out (§ 38). On the other hand, in the middle of a word an Aspirate standing by itself in an open syllable with short *ě*, if it is preceded by an open syllable with a short vowel⁽¹⁾, surrenders its *ě*-sound quite as readily as other consonants, in the case described in § 37 *ad fin.*, and attaches itself to the foregoing syllable, e. g. **የውሕዝ** *ye-weh-zū* from **የውሕዝ** *ye-wé-hez*; while it seems better, after long vowels, with the exception of *ā*, to preserve the Aspirate with *ě* as an independent syllable, e. g. **የደዕረኒ** *ye-se-‘e-ranī*. Since farther an Aspirate, particularly **ኀ** or **ዐ**, at least with certain vowels, is of easier utterance before a vowel than after it, the vowel in one or two cases seems to be shifted from its position before the Aspirate and placed after it. This appears to be most obligatory, when an open syllable is followed by a closed one ending in **ኀ** or **ዐ** and to be pronounced with short *e*, e. g. **የገበኀ** properly *ye-gá-be’*, but certainly better pronounced *yegáb-‘e*; so with **የሐምዐ**; on the other hand, to be sure, **ዐ**, **ኀ** and **ኀ** admit more readily of an *ě* coming before them even in this case,

(1) This vowel, in accordance with § 45, is *ě*.

as in **ይነጽሕ**, **ይፈርህ**. Nominal stems, like **ቂናዝእ**, **ጸዋልዕ**, **ደዋርህ** &c. are, independently of this, to be pronounced by preference *quanāz-'e* &c. according to § 38. But whether also in cases like **ይኑኅ** the pronunciation should be *yenūh* only, and not rather *yenū'h*, we must leave undecided, through lack of information on the point; but perhaps it should be noticed, that in several formations of this class the pronunciation with *ū* is avoided, and the one with *ā* is substituted: **ይማእ**— § 53.

§ 44. (2) *Aspirates have a marked preference for the a-sound*⁽¹⁾. Preference of Aspirates for the a-sound.
This preference, however, is made good by them in two quite opposite ways:—they either bring about an *a*-sound next them instead of a different one founded in the form, or else, if for other reasons they cannot bring about such an *a*-sound, they drive off the *a* of a foregoing open syllable, just to avoid being attracted by it. The first case does not occur so often; the second is more common.

(a) An *a*-sound appears most generally before the Aspirates, when an Aspirate, which has to be pronounced with *a*, is preceded by another consonant as a prefixed syllable and therefore one properly to be spoken with short *ě*; in this case *ā* takes its place in the prefix also, in room of *ě*. Thus we say **መሐር**, **መሐሪ** &c. instead of **ጦሐር**, **ጦሐሪ**; **ሠሐቅ** “laughter” for **ሥሐቅ** (even **መዐት** for **ጦዐት** “wrath”, although **ዐ** is properly to be given as a double consonant); **አሐውር** for **እሐውር**; **የዐቅብ** for **ይዐቅብ**; and, in this way, the personal prefixes of the Imperfect or the Subjunctive of Verbs, which have an Aspirate as first radical, have always *a* instead of *ě* (if the Aspirate has *ā*); but when **ኢ**, „not” is placed before the Personal prefix **ይ**, the **ይ** may more easily hold its ground instead of **የ**, because the sound, *yě*, is supported by the foregoing *i*, e. g. **ኢይዐቅብ** and **ኢየዐቅብ**. However, the rule which is enunciated here about replacing *ě* by *ā* came into full prevalence only at a comparatively recent date. In the older manuscripts and the impressions which follow them, forms⁽²⁾ like **ጦሐር**, **ይሐውሩ**, **ይአጦን** &c. are still very common, while it is always possible that even in earlier times an *a*-sound was given in speech, although

(1) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 148 *sqq.*

(2) And just because these occur most frequently in the oldest records, they can by no means be regarded,—with LUDOLF, II, 7, 7,—as copyists' errors.

not in writing⁽¹⁾. But if the Aspirate has a different vowel from *ä*, a syllable prefixed to it keeps its *ě*, e. g. **ይኒይስ**, **ጽዓቂ**, **ምሐር** &c. The preference of the Aspirate for *ä* instead of *ě* is shown in a different way in the formation of the Subjunctive in Stem I, from roots which have an Aspirate as middle or final radical (§ 92). It is only in rare instances that under the influence of an Aspirate a foregoing vowel, stronger than *ě*, passes into *a* or *ā*,—as when one gives for example the word in frequent use for “day”, in the form **መዐልት**, rather than **ጥዐልት**, its original pronunciation. In a similar manner this influence is shown in the Subj. of several roots *mediae vocalis*, and we say therefore **ይማእ**, **ይበእ**, as contrasted with **ይነም**, **ይቁም** &c.; and on account of the Aspirate we also say **ነዋኅ** “high”, instead of **ነዊኅ**. Occasionally too an original *ä*,—which is softened into *ě* in similar words when unprovided with an Aspirate,—is retained on account of the Aspirate, e. g. **ሀብት** “gift” (§ 106) in contrast with **ጥንት**, and **ጸሀርት** “pot” a side-form to **ጽሀርት**.

Reduction
of *ä* of open
Syllable
preceding
Aspirate to
ě in certain
cases.

§ 45. (b) When an Aspirate has a different vowel from *ä* or *ā*,—then *ä*, occurring in an open syllable immediately preceding it, is almost invariably reduced to *ě*, because the Aspirate would become strongly attracted to the foregoing *a*, and be obliged to surrender to it a part of its force (v. *infra* § 46 sq.)⁽²⁾. By reducing the *a* to *ě*, however, the language obviates this attraction and thereby secures the distinct pronunciation of the Aspirate. Reduction of *a* to *ě* is most binding, when the Aspirate following has itself an *ě*; but even when it has a different vowel, such reduction almost invariably takes place. Thus from roots *mediae gutturalis* Nouns of the type **ገቢር** are formed like **ልሂቅ** “old”; **ርሐብ** “broad” (but Fem. **ረሐብ**); and of the type **ገቡር**, like **እትድ** “Sunday”; also Infinitives, of the type **ገቢር**, **ገቢሮት** &c., like **ድሂን** „to escape safe”; **ምሐሮት** “to pity”; **ተምሂር** “to be taught” &c.; and even the Imperfect, of the type **ይገብር**, **ያገብር** &c., from such roots always takes, in the very same way, the form **ይምከር** *ye-mé-her*; **ይምከል** *ye-mé-hel*; **ይምከር** *yā-mé-her*; **ይከዕ**

(1) Compare the relation between a Hebrew *Sh'va simplex* and *compositum*.

(2) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 135 sq., who has noticed also a few rare exceptions (p. 186).

yek-ū for *ye-ke-ū* (§ 37), instead of **ḡho-** or **ḡhō-**; and only when the Aspirate has to be uttered as a double letter, can *a* be retained, *e. g.* in **ḡመሀር**, Subjunctive from **ḡሚሀር**, although even for such a Subjunctive one prefers to say **ጸምሕር** *ye-méḥher*. Even in the forms of the Perfect of these roots, of the type **ገብረ** and **ተገብረ**—which originally had the sound *gábera*, *tagábera*, but later became *gábra*, *tagábra* according to § 37—the *a* of the first radical must necessarily be softened into *ě*, partly because the second radical at one time formed a syllable of its own, and partly to prevent the lengthening of the *a* following the first radical into *ā* (by § 46), thus **ወሕደ**, **ረአየ** (for **ወሕደ**, **ረአየ**); and **ተገሕወ**, **ተረአየ** (for **ተገሕወ** and **ተረአየ**). In the same way **ንሕነ** “we” is given, instead of the original **ነሕነ**, to avoid the obligation of saying **ናሕነ** according to § 46. Roots with an Aspirate as third radical, in all forms in which the second radical should be given with *ă* as an open syllable, turn this *ă* into *ě*,—thus, in the Perfect of all the Stems:—**ነሥኡ**, **ሰብሐ** *sabbēḥa*, **ባልሐ**, **አንሥኡ**, **ተፈሥሐ** &c. It is the same with the Subjunctive, Imperative and Imperfect of certain Stems, like **ጸንሥኡ** (for **ጸንሠኡ**); **ንሥኡ** (for **ንሠኡ**); **ትትነሥኡ** (for **ትትነሠኡ**) &c., and in Nominal forms of the type **መግቦሪ** and **አግቦሪ**, *e. g.* **መንጽሐ** “purifier”; **መንቅሂ** and **አንቅሂ** “awakener”. The *ě* of the second radical, which has originated in this way, may however completely disappear, according to § 37, if an open syllable precedes, so that the pronunciation seems to be **ነሥኡ** *nás'ā*, **ትትነሥኡ** *tetnas'ī*, **ንሥኡ** *nes'ī*⁽¹⁾.

§ 46. (3) *An Aspirate may lengthen a Vowel which precedes it in the same syllable*, by giving up to the vowel some portion of its own breathing, weakening itself however in the process. In Hebrew, where the same phenomenon occurs⁽²⁾, it is only the softer Aspirates which exercise this influence; but in Ethiopic the five Aspirates all do so in an equal degree, for even

Lengthening of Vowel preceding Aspirate in the same Syllable.

⁽¹⁾ HUPFELD, it is true, is of opinion, p. 12, that **ሰምዐ** and **መጽኦ** were pronounced *samā* and *mašā*, and even **አስተበውሐ** *astabawa*, with entire suppression of the Aspirate; but this is refuted by the written language, for such forms as **መጸ** and **መጸኦ** are never met with in writing. Speaking generally, HUPFELD's entire account of the relation of Aspirates and Vowels is a mistaken one, because it starts from the erroneous assumption that the Amharic pronunciation of these letters approaches the original.

⁽²⁾ EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Sprachl.*’ § 54 sq.

the three harder ones became softer and softer as time went on (v. § 24)⁽¹⁾.

(a) This influence becomes operative most regularly when the vowel of the syllable is *ä*, both in those cases in which the Aspirate closes the syllable, as in **ይምጸእ** for **ይምጸእ**; **እትፈሣሕ** for **እትፈሣሕ**; **አማሕፀን** for **አመሕፀን**; **ሰማዕኩ** for **ሰመዕኩ**; **በቋዕኩ** for **በቋዕኩ**; **ቡጉብጉ** for **ቡጉብጉ**; **ማእከል** for **መእከል**, and in those cases in which this Aspirate is followed by another consonant either originally vowel-less or which has become so, as a result of later pronunciation, as in **መጥበሕት** “knife”; **ጠፍላሕት** “piece of money”; **ጸላእት** “enemies”; **ሳእር** “a (skin) bottle”; **ሣሕቅ** “mockery”⁽²⁾. Words in which this lengthening of the *ä* is sometimes avoided are very few in number, such as **ገሀሀ** “full moon”; **አጎዝ** “pledge”; **ጉሕለወ** “to be crafty”, which occurs oftener than **ጓሕለወ**. But still it should be noticed, that in the oldest manuscripts and printed works this rule was only in rare cases consistently observed, and **መእከል**, **ይምጸእ** and so forth, for instance, were at one time written just as often or even oftener,—from which we may perhaps rightly conclude that this phonetic rule was not developed until later times. They went a good deal farther in Amharic, and in such cases completely suppressed the Aspirate, whether hard or soft, *e. g.* **ላም** “bull”, instead of the Ethiopic **ላህም**⁽³⁾.

Of course this rule is not to be applied in the combining of words. For example, we can never say **በእከይ** for **በእከይ** *ba'-e-kāye* “through wickedness”. And farther, the short **አ** of the Causative Stems and of the Collective forms of the Noun is treated in exactly the same way, and as a mere external attachment, *e. g.* **አዕረረ** “he rested”; **አጎለቀ** “he made an end of”; **አሕዛብ** “nations”; **አሕቅልት** “fields”;—for which forms we never find **አዕረረ** &c.;

(1) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 131 sq.

(2) The pronunciation of those words which end in Fem. *t* presents no kind of difficulty in this case; and even the others, like **ሣሕቅ**, may easily be pronounced as monosyllables, if the hard Aspirate is given with a soft utterance; but if the older pronunciation of the Aspirate is adhered to, they must be given like *šāh-qʰ*.

(3) The examples cited by KÖNIG, p. 132 sq. to support the contention that even a Guttural, which is not without a vowel, may lengthen foregoing *ä*, rest upon corrupt readings from Herm. and 4. Ezra.

but other Nominal prefixes, like **መ** and **ተ** when set before Aspirates, certainly follow the general rule. In the same way the lengthening of the *a* is better to remain in abeyance before double Aspirates, e. g. **መሀርት** *mahheröt*. In Reflexive Stems of the type **ተገብረ** it occasionally happens, it is true, that the first radical has its *a* lengthened before the Aspirate which has become vowel-less, e. g. **ተኳሕሏ**; but, as a rule, both in this case and in others in which it is desired to avoid lengthening the *ä*, this *ä* is rather softened into *ě*, just as in **ተገሕሠ** instead of **ተገሐሠ**, § 45.

But now if a vowel-less Aspirate, which has brought about the lengthening of the *ä* of its syllable, assumes a vowel in the process of formation and inflection, and is thus separated from its original syllable, then the *ä* ceases to be lengthened, and it is, if possible, softened into *ě*, e. g. **ይምጽኡ**: “(that) he come?”, but **ይምጽኡ** “they shall come” for **ይምጽኡ**. Only, in the Subjunctive and Imperative of certain roots I. or II. *infirmæ*, the long *ā* is retained even in inflection, because it serves at the same time to compensate for a radical which has been thrown out, e. g. in **ይገኝ**, **ይገኝ**; **ባኢ**, **ባኢ** &c. (§ 53). It is retained in the same way, as belonging to the stem, all through the inflection of nouns of the types **ጥጣኝ** “want”, **የዋህ** “meekness” (§ 143 sq.).

(b) But even when the vowel of the syllable is *ě*, it may be lengthened by a vowel-less Aspirate coming after it. In several words in very frequent use, this lengthening of the *ě* into *ē* has been given expression to in writing, even from remote times. The feeble root **ርእየ** “to see” invariably forms the Imperfect **ይረኣ**, by the original **ይርኣይ** (for **ይረኣይ**, by § 45) *ye-ré-’ě-i* becoming *ye-rē-’i* = *ye-rē-’i*, because the *i* drives off the *ě* preceding it, and **ኣ** influences the foregoing syllable. In a manner quite analogous **ይረኣ**⁽¹⁾ is met with, from the root **ርዕየ** “to herd (a flock)”, § 92. In the same way **ይቤሉ** “they said” was produced from **ይብሉ** *ye-béh-lū*, through the lengthening of the *ě* and the elimination of the Aspirate in accordance with § 47. In other cases, it is true, this lengthening of the *ě* under the influence of the Aspirate is not expressed in written form, but yet it is evident that it must be adopted in pronunciation; for words like **ርእየ**, though perhaps spoken once like **ርእየ**, were

(¹) A like form, **ይሰኢ** from **ሰኢ** “to be unable”—is cited by LUDOLF in ‘Lex.’, col. 172.

at a later time certainly contracted always into *rē'ya* or *rē'ya*; and the case is similar with **ውእቱ**; **ይእዜ**; **ትከብእት** *tes-bē't*; **ትፍርህት** *tefrēht*. Farther, the corresponding groups of letters containing harder Aspirates were in later times assuredly uttered in the same way constantly, *e. g.* **አፍርሃት**, **ትፍሥሕት** *afreht*, *tefsēht*; thus too **ምዕር**: *mē'r* for *mē'r^e*; **ግዕዝ**: *gēz*:—so that one may appropriately transcribe these words, as *meer*, *geez*⁽¹⁾. Even in cases like **ይምሕር** for **ይመሕር** (§ 45); **ምሕርከ**; **ተትሕትከ** (§ 102), it is matter of question whether they were not in later times given in speech in a contracted form, as *yemēhr*, *mēhrka*, *tatēhtka*, instead of *yemēher*, *mehérka*, *tatehétka*.

Occasional
Disappearance of
Aspirates.

§ 47. 4. *An Aspirate may disappear altogether, after it has given up its force to a Vowel.* This took place with considerable regularity in several cases, at the end of a word which terminated in an Aspirate, preceded by *ā* lengthened by the Aspirate, as in **ጥፃ** “parting-gift” for **ጥፃእ**; **ድምድማ(ሕ)** “hair of the head”; **ጽላ(ፅ)** “table (of stone)” &c.; but with other words it occurs in but a few manuscripts. In the middle of the word the suppression of the Aspirate usually occurs, when certain inflectional syllables, or other additions, come before or after it. Quite regularly does this happen in the Imperfect and Subjunctive formations of Verbal Stems commencing with **አ**, **አን**, **አስተ**,—by the personal prefixes **ይ**, **ት**, **እ**, **ን** before the **አ** becoming first of all **የ**, **ተ**, **አ**, **ነ** (§ 44), and then coalescing with the following *a* of **አ** into **ያ**, **ታ**, **አ**, **ና**, while the Aspirate is thrown out⁽²⁾; but in other forms from such stems the Aspirate is discharged without leaving a trace, as in **መጥመቂ**⁽³⁾; **መስተሣህል**, **ምስትጉብእ**. Similarly the *h* of the Suffix Pronouns **ሁ**, **ሃ**, **ሆሙ**, **ሆን** is often thrown out, § 151. Other instances of throwing out an Aspirate are more accidental and rare, but even in these instances, as well as in those just mentioned, it is chiefly

(1) For farther conjectures v. HAUPT, ‘The Assyrian E-vowel’ in ‘*Amer. Journ. of Philol.*’, Vol. VIII, p. 281.

(2) On the other hand, forms like **አአምር** “I know”; **እእመን** “I am to believe” are not farther contracted: **እኅዝ**, *Cant.* 7, 9, *Ps.* 17, 41 is merely a bad reading for **እእኅዝ**.

(3) [That is to say, the Participle, or Participial Noun, which is formed from **መ** and **አጥመቀ** (II, 1 of **ጠመቀ**) becomes **መጥምቅ** or **መጥመቂ**, the initial **አ** of the Conjugational form disappearing. TR.]

አ and **ሀ** which exhibit this fugitive tendency. When the **አ** of the Vocative is appended to a noun, the Aspirate is given up:—**አግዚአ** from **አግዚአ** + **አ**; **ብአሲቶ**, from **ብአሲት** + **አ**, § 142. **ይክል** *yekel* is always said and written for **ይክህል** *yekéhel*; **ይብል** *yebel* for **ይብህል** *yebéhel*; **ይበል** *yebal* for **ይብህል**; **በል** *bal* for **ብህል**; **አበል** for **አብህል**, and so on (v. also **ይቤሉ** § 46):—**ልሂቅ** “presbyter” is usually contracted into **ሊቅ**; and **ማሪ** “seer” came from **መርኢ**. Probably too **ስርናይ** “wheat” came from **ስዕርናይ** (“hairy”, cf. **ጥገኞ**)⁽¹⁾.

The later pronunciation however, and also the corresponding manuscripts, carry this process farther. A word like **ክልኤ** was even pronounced *klē*; and **በአንተ** and **ዘአንበል**, although compounded of two words each, had the *a* and **አ** thrown out and were pronounced *bénta* and *zénbala*: also **መላክ** is found here and there for **መልአክ** “messenger”, and **አርስት** for **አርአስት** “heads”⁽²⁾. The older times knew nothing as yet of these corruptions of speech and writing. But even in older manuscripts, when in any word an Aspirate, with *ā* or *ǎ* in an open syllable, follows a closed syllable, the *a*-sound is displaced and set before the Aspirate, *e. g.* **አጋዕዚ** for **አግዓዚ**. This occurs most frequently in Numerals, among which, particularly in later manuscripts, **ሰባዕቱ** and **ተሰዕቱ** are often met with for original **ሰብዐቱ** and **ተስዐቱ**, § 158. In these cases too the tendency is again indicated, to make the Aspirate dwindle away more and more⁽³⁾.

§ 48. 5. A final peculiarity of the Aspirates is this, that *they Aspirates commonly draw the Word-Tone to themselves, when they are given and the Word-Tone.* with *-a-* following them⁽⁴⁾. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that an Aspirate communicates a share of its own force to the vowel *a* which is the most nearly related to it, and thus makes the vowel stronger (§ 46). Thus the Reflexive and Causative-Reflexive Stems, which otherwise take the tone on the third-last syllable, are—when they belong to roots *mediae gutturalis*—pronounced by preference as follows:—**ተአኀዘ** *ta-’āhāza*; **አስተምሐረ** *astamhāra*; **አስተርአየ** *astar’āya*. Farther; forms like **ሥርዐት**

(1) On the other hand, the **አ** is kept on in **አማኣኮ** = **አመ** + **አኮ**, § 39.

(2) [Cf. also spellings like **ዐረየ** = **አርአየ**, and **አስመ** = **አስምዐ** *Kebrā Nag.* p. XVII.]

(3) Cf. also PLATT, ‘*The Ethiopic Didascalia*’ (London 1834), p. 17, 3, Note.

(4) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 140 sq.

are not pronounced *šér'at* in the usual paroxytone fashion, but *šer'át*⁽¹⁾. In consequence of this more emphatic pronunciation of *a* after an Aspirate, later scribes began to write long *ā* in such cases, although it had absolutely no foundation in the formation, *e. g.* **ተለግለ**; **ተመርገወ**; **የግርግ**; and, *vice versâ*, a long *ā*, founded in the form, was occasionally written as a short *ă*, as people had become accustomed to pronounce even short *a* long, when it came after an Aspirate; *cf. e. g.* **አአምር** for **አአምር**. This led at last to confusion in the manuscripts, by long *ā* and short *ă*—especially when accompanying **አ** and **ዕ**—being rendered entirely at pleasure either by **አ**, **ዐ** or by **አ**, **ዓ**⁽²⁾. A farther deterioration in the mode of writing, in another but similar case, appeared later in less accurate manuscripts: the Personal Prefixes of the Imperfect (and Subjunctive), which in the Causative Stems are **ያ**, **ታ**, **አ**, **ና**, are written **የ**, **ተ**, **አ**, **ነ** by later scribes, when the first radical is an Aspirate, because they clearly thought that an *ă* before an Aspirate is somewhat prolonged, without any farther notification being required, and that there is accordingly no difference in pronunciation between **ያዐርፍ** and **የዐርፍ**.

አ passing
into a Semi-
vowel.

6. The softest Aspirate **አ** passes into a Semivowel in certain cases. This takes place more frequently in Arabic and Syriac; but in Ethiopic the phenomenon,—apart from certain root-formations,—is limited to a single case: When **አ**, “not” is prefixed to a 1st pers. sing. Imperf. or Subjunct., or to a Causative or Reflexive Stem beginning with **አ**, the **አ** passes regularly into **የ**, except with verbs *primae gutturalis* in the Imperfect of the First Stem:⁽³⁾—**አ.ይገብር** = **አ.እገብር**; **አ.ያአምር** = **አ.አአምር**; **አ** coming after **አ**, always becomes **ያ** then, by the fading Aspirate lengthening the vowel:—**አ.ያግበረ** = **አ.አግበረ**; **አ.ያንጦልዐ** = **አ.አንጦልዐ**; **በአ.ያአምር** = **በአ.አአምር**⁽⁴⁾. In some rare cases this phonetic transmutation occasions obscurity. For the rest *cf.* § 41.

(1) LUDOLF, ‘Gramm.’ I, 7.

(2) This shifting-about takes place most frequently in the case of the **አ** of the 1st pers. of the Imperf. and Subjunct. of the Causative Stems. In certain MSS. **አ** is almost always read in this case.

(3) *Cf.* KÖNIG, p. 125 sq.

(4) It is but very rarely indeed that original **አ** or **እ** is retained after **አ**, as *e. g.* in **አ.አትረፈ** Numb. 21, 35; **አ.እሁብ** Deut. 2, 5, 19; **አ.አትገሐስ** Deut. 2, 27.

On the *Doubling of Aspirates* v. § 56.

Of the other consonants only **ϕ** and **ζ** share, now and again, in the peculiarities of the Aspirates, *e. g.* in the matter of their predilection for the *a*-sound, § 105 *sq.*, and in other respects (*cf.* § 96 on **ⲡϕ**)⁽¹⁾.

(β) THE VOWELS *I* AND *U* AND THE SEMIVOWELS.

§ 49. It has already been pointed out (§ 40) that the Vowels *i* and *u* (and also *ai*, *au*, *ē* and *ō*) are often hardened into their corresponding Semivowels, when they meet with other vowels. The general rules, which were then laid down as governing the appearance of such hardening, must however undergo various limitations and special modifications, according to the immediate peculiarities of the several kinds of roots. Besides, special phonetic changes make their appearance, when an *i* meets with *i* or *y*, or a *u* with *u* or *w*. And lastly, *u* at least or *w* is liable in certain cases to be removed altogether⁽²⁾.

Hardening
of *i* and *u*, as
1st Radicals,
into
Semivowels.

1. *Hardening of i and u into Semivowels.* (a) All roots, which at one time commenced with *i* or *u*, must of necessity, according to §§ 34 and 40, have hardened these vowels into *y* and *w*. They are therefore pronounced in the ground-form as roots with initial **ϣ** and **ω**, and this pronunciation is maintained whenever a vowel has to be uttered after the first radical, *e. g.* **ϣⲉⲟ**; **ϣⲏⲏ**; **ⲉⲏⲏ**; **ωⲕⲉ**; **ωⲏⲏ**⁽³⁾. As soon, however, as these letters come into the interior of a word and terminate syllables, in consequence of formative prefixes being placed before them, they seek to resume their vowel-character. If in that case *a* precedes them, they form with it a diphthong (§ 39) which is written **ⲁⲉ**, **ⲁⲏ**:—**ⲕⲱⲕⲉ** *aulada*; **ⲕⲉⲉⲟ**; **ⲧⲱⲏⲧ** “barter”; **ⲧⲱⲏⲧ** “a game”; **ⲟⲱⲕⲉⲧ** “midwife”; **ⲕⲱⲕⲏ** “(ear-) rings”; and although this diphthong does not indeed pass into a mixed sound in the formation of the Verb, it does so quite usually in Nominal Stems of the types **ϣⲟⲏⲕ**

(1) *Cf.* also KÖNIG, pp. 134 *sq.* and 151.

(2) *Cf.* KÖNIG, p. 108 *sqq.*

(3) It has been pointed out already (§ 19) that in later times **ⲉ** and **ⲏ**, when they had to be pronounced with *ē* in open syllable, were again given directly as *i* and *u*;—thus, *ibūs*, *uūd*.

“antiphone”; **ፖሰርት** “a saw”, and now and then in Participial forms like **ፖረከ** “heir” (alongside of **መውለዲት**, given above). After *ā*, *i* may easily have a vowel-sound, *e. g.* **ያይድዕ** *yāide*, but *u* must be hardened, *e. g.* **ያውሥኦ** *yāwše*. After the short, dissimilar *ě*, *u* may become a Semivowel, if it closes the syllable, *e. g.* **ይውግዑ** *yewge’ū* (not *yūge’ū*), but yet *ew* is not in favour, and as a rule it is simplified in Verbal formation by throwing out the *u* (*w*), § 53. In Nominal formation, on the other hand, the *u* generally pushes out a foregoing *ě*; and in this way forms are continually appearing, like **መላድ**, **መሐዝ**;—more rarely we have **ፖውግል** alongside of **መግል** before the Aspirate; also **ትውከልት** and **ቱከልት**⁽¹⁾; **ትውልድ** and **ቱልድ**. *Ī* after *ě* is, in this case, of necessity contracted into *ī*.

Vowel-Pronunciation of *i* and *u* as 2nd Radicals.

§ 50. (b) Roots, which have *i* or *u* as second radical, cling most tenaciously to the vowel-pronunciation,—so closely, in fact, that even when according to general phonetic rules hardening ought to ensue, they often throw out the vowel that follows *i* or *u*, in preference to hardening the *i* or *u*. But of course it is only the short vowels *ă*, *ě* which can be dislodged in this way, and these only when they are less essential to the formation. Thus in the Perfect of the Simple Stem and Stems derived from it, the *ă* or *ě*, which should appear after the second radical, is removed, *e. g.* in **ፖተ** for *ma-ue-ta*; **ጌጠ** for *ma-ia-ṭa* or *ma-ie-ṭa*⁽²⁾. It is the same with the Subjunctive and Imperative of these Stems, *e. g.* **ይመት** for *yem-u^{et}t* or *yem-u^{at}t*; **ይግጥ** for *yem-i^{et}t* or *yem-i^{at}t* (but in these cases *ua* is sometimes contracted into the single sound *ō*, by § 40:—**ይሐር** “(that) he go”, v. § 93); and it is only when the third radical also is a vowel (Semivowel) that the second must of necessity be hardened into a Semivowel, thus—**ይወየ**; **ረወየ** (*cf.* § 94 *ad fin.*); **ይርወይ** *yerwai*; **ሐይወ** *haiwa* (for *hay^ewa*); **ይኦየው**. In like manner, when a short vowel comes into the formation after the first radical, the words from these roots preserve the vowel-pronunciation of the second radical (1) by making it coalesce with a foregoing *a* into a diphthong or a mixed vowel, *e. g.*, of

(1) Manifestly both pronunciations, *tew* and *tū*, are possible here; for, had they always said *tū*, it would have been always written in that way.

(2) That the diphthong must always in these cases pass into the mixed sound (*ō* or *ē*) is taught by § 39.

the type **ገብር**,—**ሞት** “death”; **ሜጥ** “price”; or **ሐይቅ** “shore”; **ዐውድ** “circuit”, “circle” (and often in this way as a diphthong after an Aspirate, seeing that *a* has a somewhat stronger sound after the Aspirate § 48), and (2) by removing a foregoing *ē*, unless it is essential to the formation, *e. g.* **ቂም** “revenge” (type-**ገብር**); **ኑህ** “length”; **ሂደት** “robbery”; **ሐረት** “course”. On the other hand we necessarily say, in formations from roots which are at the same time *tertiæ infirmæ* **ሕይወት** *hēiwat*; **ጥወየት** *tēwyat* (rarely **ሐወት** &c.); *v. supra*. But even these roots must permit the hardening of their vowel-radical in the following cases:—1st, when the second radical is doubled:—**ጸውዐ** *šáwwē’a*; **ኀየለ** *háyýala*; **ጉየ** *guáyya*; **መፈውስ** *mafáwwes*; 2nd, when it is followed by a long vowel, or even by a short one, provided it is essential to the formation:—**ዕወር** “blindness”; **ሀየል** “stag”; **ንዋም** “sleep”; **አብያጽ** “companions”, from **ቢጽ**; **ምየጥ** “turned”; **መዊት** “to die” (Inf.)—(On *i* after *i*, and *ū* after *u*, *v. § 52*); 3rd, when the radical in question comes to stand between two vowels, of which the first is a long one, *e. g.* **ተራወጸ**; **ተከየደ**; **ሣውዕ** “sacrificer”; **መጸውር** “carrying-poles”; **ተግደን** (properly *ta’āyen*, but according to § 40 *ta’āin*), or between two vowels, of which the first is indeed a short one, but of which the second is essential to the form and therefore irremovable:—**ይመውት**; **ይመይጥ** properly *yemá-wet*, *yemá-yet*, but according to § 40 *ye-maut*, *yemait* (yet never **ይሞት**⁽¹⁾; **ይሜጥ**); 4th, when it is followed by two vowel-less consonants, seeing that by § 35 *sq.* no long vowel can stand in a doubly closed syllable, —thus **ትዕይንት** *te’-yént*; **ትዝውፍት** *tez-wéft*; **አስይፍት** “swords” (and yet we have **አኪስት** as well as **አክይስት**, because Sibilant and Mute are very closely attached to one another).

§ 51. (c) Ethiopic roots which from the first have had *i* or *u* as their last radical, exhibit a marked tendency towards hardened pronunciation: they farther hold tenaciously to their termination, and do not readily allow it to glide into other vowels. For this reason, roots ending in *i* and *u* are very carefully discriminated from one another, and do not pass into one another in the course of formation, as happens in other languages. The vowel-pronunciation of the last radical, in forms from such roots, appears only when that radical has no vowel after it or at most a short and

Hardening
i and u as
3rd Radi-
cals.

(1) [V., however, *Kebra Nag.* 84 b 7 (**አሞት**).]

easily removable *ě*, and no long vowel before it (§ 40); but yet there is this exception,—that *i* is given with a vowel-sound even after long *ā* (§ 39). This rule is everywhere applied in the formation and inflection of the Verb, thus **ተለወ**; **ርእየ**; **ረሰየ**; but **ተለውከ** *talāuka*, and **ተሉከ**; **ርኢከ**; **ረሰይከ** *rassāika*. A foregoing short *ě* generally coalesces with *ū* and *ī*, thus **ይተሉ**; **ይሬሲ** (rarely **ይተልው**; **ይሬስይ**; cf. **ትዘምው** Lev. 20, 6; **ያጎትው** Ex. 27, 20; **ያጎትው** Ex. 27, 21—otherwise in 38, 13—⁽¹⁾); also **ደውው** v. *infra* § 99, I). Farther, in Nominal formation this rule holds good always, when the noun does not end in *i* or *u*, e. g. in **ልቡና** “understanding”⁽²⁾ and **ዕሪና** “equality”, of the type **ግብርና**; **ትንቢት** “prophecy”; **ትሥጉት** “incarnation”, of the type **ትግብርት**; **መክሪት** “spade”; **መንሱት** “temptation”, of the type **መግብርት**; **ነዐውት** *na’āut*, “hunters”; **ኅለይት** *halāit*, “singers”; **መርዔት** “herd”; **መስኮት** “window”, of the type **መግብርት**; and so throughout in all Feminines which are formed by a closely attached, vowel-less **ት**, e. g. **ሕፃት** “a girl betrothed”—*sponsa*, **ዕሉት** “apostate” *f.*, from **ሕፀይ** and **ዕልው** (§ 36); **መፍሪት** “fruitful” *f.*, from **መፍርይ**. When the Noun, however, ends with the last radical, different nouns follow different courses, according as they retain or give up the fugitive *ě*, in which (§ 38) the pure Nominal stem once terminated. In such formations final *u* may have a vowel-sound only after *ā*, by forming with the latter either a diphthong or a mixed sound:—**መፀው** “Spring”; **ሥረው** “roots”; **አበው** “fathers”; **ህቦ** “dew”; **ገቦ** “side” (of the body): **ማዕጸ** “lock of a door”: in all other cases the terminal *ě* is retained, and the vowel *u* is hardened into *w*:—**ሕያው** *heyāw^e*; **ምክኝው** *mek’āw^e*; **ተሊው** *talīw^e*; **ሥርው** *šérw^e*; **በድው** *bádūw^e*; **መኃትው** *maḥātūw^e*, for *maḥātew^e* (§ 37); **መደልው** *madāllew^e*; **መጸገው** *mašāggew^e*; **መትልው** *mátlew^e*; now and then too *u* is thrown off when it comes after long *ā* (§ 53). On the other hand, *i* has a leaning to the vowel-pronunciation, and maintains itself as *i* after long *ā* and *ū* (§ 39):—**ሐጋይ**; **ብካይ**; **ጥራይ**; **ምርዓይ**; **ብሉይ** ⁽³⁾. It forms with *ā* a diphthong, or a mixed vowel: **ዕበይ**; **ጽጌ**; **ለፌ**; **መሥቂ**; and as a rule it forms, with foregoing *ě*, long *ī*, e. g. **መፍርይ**, **መሠርይ**,—probably not

(1) [Cf. also *Kebra Nag.*, p. XVII.]

(2) Yet here too *ew* is tolerated, e. g. **ስርገውና** “adornment”, cf. § 49.

(3) Although here too *belāy^e*, *bekāy^e* &c. may be given.

mafrej^e and *mašarrey^e*, but *máfrī* and *mašárri*, since we find these forms quite as often written **መፍሪ** and **መሠሪ**; so also **በሕርይ** “pearl” = **በሕሪ** *bāhrī* or *bāhreje*. Thus in the Noun, *i* is necessarily hardened into **ይ** and *ě* added to it, only when it is preceded by a vowel-less consonant, as in **ረእይ** *rā’ye*, of the type **ገብር**; and it may be given at pleasure as a vowel or as *ye*, when the introductory consonant of the syllable should properly have a short *ě*, while the preceding syllable ends in a long vowel, e. g. **መከልይ** “talents”, either *makāly^e* (§ 37) or *makālī*, as it may be even written **መከሊ**. It is the same with **መስተዋድይ** “accuser”, and **መስተዋኒ** “actor”; and in like manner **ላሕይ** “beautiful” is to be pronounced *lāhy^e* or *lāhī⁽¹⁾*.

Both in the Verb and Noun however, *u* and *i* must invariably be hardened, whenever any firmer vowel than the fugitive *ě* has to be uttered after them (§ 40). If in LUDOLF’s time words like **ፈነወ**, **ዕዩወ** were spoken as *fānnaua*, *ešaua*, we are not at liberty to regard that pronunciation as original or deserving of imitation.

§ 52. 2. If a formative vowel *ī* or *ū* meets with a radical *ī* or *ū*, it never coalesces originally into one sound (*ī* or *ū*), but the radical *ī* or *ū* must be hardened into **ይ** or **ወ**, whether before or after the formative vowel⁽²⁾:—*yī* and *wū*, when produced in this way, generally remain unchanged, e. g. **ይተልወ**, **ትበልይ**, **ገላይ**, **ሥርወ**. But roots *mediae infirmae*, which in other respects also have peculiar phonetic conditions (§ 50), aim at a shorter pronunciation in such cases, by shortening the long vowel and doubling the semivowel instead (making *yī* = *yǐ* = *yyi*, and *wū* = *wǐ* = *wwu*), so that the result, in accordance with § 19, is *yyě* or *wwě*⁽³⁾. Consequently, Infinitives and Adjectives of the type **ገብር** from roots *middle i* may, it is true, run like **ሠዩም** “to place”, **መዩጥ** “to turn”, **ቀዩሕ** “red”—and these forms are still found in abundance in the older manuscripts⁽⁴⁾,—but usually they are written **ሠይም**, **መይጥ**, **ቀይሕ**. These forms then are first of all to be pronounced *šayyem*, *mayyet*, *qayyeh*; but they may be farther

Radical *ī*
or *ū* meet-
ing with
Formative
Vowel *ī* or
ū.

(¹) Cf. with these deductions the somewhat diverging ones in KÖNIG, p. 111 sqq.

(²) Otherwise with KÖNIG, p. 152 sqq.

(³) Cf. EWALD, ‘Gramm. Arab.’ §§ 387, 108.

(⁴) [Cf. also **ጠዩቅ**, *Kebra Nag.* p. XVII, sub 6.]

simplified into *šaim*, *mait*, *qaiḥ* ⁽¹⁾. In the same way Passive Participles of the type **ገብር**, from roots *middle u*, are very often met with, having the pronunciation **ግወት** *mewūt*; **ደወይ** *dewūy* (*dewūy^e*), and so in the Pl. **ግወታን** &c.; but **ግወት** and **ርወጽ** are found instead, particularly in later manuscripts, the pronunciation being first *méwwet*, but afterwards, in abbreviated form, *mewwt* and *mūt*, with the plural both **ግወታን** *meww^etān* and **ሙታን** *mūtān*. And yet it should be noticed that in the Singular certainly the style **ሙት**, **ሩጽ** does not occur, and even in the Plural it is rare. On the other hand the forms **ደወይ**, **ርወይ** are preferred, from roots whose third radical also is weak; but in the Plural we have **ዱያን** (as well as **ደወያን**) from *dewweyān*. But when the group *īy* or *ūw* is produced by the meeting of these sounds, it can be tolerated only when its elements are shared between two syllables, as *e. g.* in **ነቢያት** (along with which we have **ነብያት**) “prophets”. Besides, these sounds—which are somewhat difficult to utter—are simplified by *ī* and *ū* being partly hardened, whereby *īy* and *ūw* become *eyy* and *eww* ⁽²⁾ (§ 19). *īy* alone has kept its place, and that too in but one single type, viz. in Adjectives of the form **ገብር**, as if the formative sound *ī* had been of greater importance for them. It is thus that words like **በቢይ**, **ነቢይ** &c. originated,—which were certainly spoken at one time, like ‘*abīy^e*, ‘*nabīy^e*. In later times, however, when the fugitive *ē* was given up, ‘*abīy*, ‘*nabīy* were contracted directly into ‘*abī*, ‘*nabī*. Thus too we have the Fem. **ነቢያት** *nabīt*; and although in most cases the **ይ** is still constantly written, yet, in one or two detached words of this form, used rather in a Substantive sense, it is regularly thrown out, as in **ሐቢ** “security” (*legal term*); and **ጠሊ** “goat”; **ነቢያት** is written also **ነቢት**.—Thus *ī* and *ū* finally coalesced into *ī*,—a phenomenon, which does not otherwise readily occur. In the other formations, however, the facilitated style prevailed completely. Accordingly, the Passive Participles of roots with final *u* (with a few deviations in detached manuscripts) run thus:—**ርከው** *rehéww^e*, **ለብው** *lebéww^e* ⁽³⁾; Plur.

(1) Like **مَيْت** from **مَيْت** for **مَوَيْت**.

(2) Cf. EWALD, ‘Gramm. Arab.’ § 108.

(3) We never find **ርት** and **ለት** given for these; and therefore HUFFELD is wrong in teaching, p. 16, that they were spoken as *rehū* and *lebū*. And farther, the pronunciation **ህለው** as *helluw* &c., recommended by LUDOLF,

ርኅዋን, ልብዋን *reḥewwān* &c.; Fem. sing. **ርኅት, ልብት** for *reḥēwut* &c. (§ 51). In the same way forms are still met with, here and there, for the Infinitive of the type **ገበር** from roots ending in *i*, like **ርኢይ**,—which is to be read *re'iyē*; but these are to be regarded as entirely obsolete. The usual form certainly is given in **በላይ, ሰትይ, ርኢይ** (never **በሊ, ሰቲ, ርኢ**), which words are accordingly to be pronounced *baléyyē, satéyyē, re'éyyē*. At the same time, of course, the pronunciation may become more contracted in special cases, *e. g.* *re'yyē* for *re'éyyē*; and **በለዮሙ** *baleyyōmū, ሰትዮሙ* *sateyyōmū*, may become, at least when carelessly employed, *balyōmū, satyōmū*. The same aversion to the sounds *iy* and *ūw*, even when they are shared between two syllables, is indicated in some other phenomena, quite outside of the formations from roots with a vowel as middle or last radical. The connecting vowel *i* of the Construct state usually passes into *ē* before the suffix pronoun **የ** (v. § 153 *sq.*). Forms are still no doubt met with, like **አምላኪየ** *amlākīya*, but, as a rule, they run like **አምላክየ** *amlākeya* ⁽¹⁾. Even **ረዳኢ** “helper” may, with the suff. **የ**, become **ረዳክየ** *radā'eya*. For the same reason, forms like **ገበርከሙዋ**, **የሀብከሙዋ** are doubtless possible (§ 40 *ad fin.*); but even in these cases the complete hardening of the *ū* is more common than the semi-hardening, thus **ገበርከምዋ** &c.

§ 53. 3. *Rejection of a u (and an i)* ⁽²⁾. Of the two Semi-vowels in Ethiopic, *w* ranks as the more indeterminate, and at the same time as the one which stands nearest the softest Aspirate **ኣ**. And just as it may for this reason (§ 41) be interpolated to separate two colliding vowels, especially when the first is an *a*-sound, so on the other hand, a radical *w*, hardened out of *u*, may at need give way to an *a*- or *e*-sound. This happens most frequently when *u* at the end of a syllable after *ē* or *ā* would have to be hardened into *w* and to form the group of sounds, *ēw, āw*, which is so little in favour. In the Subjunctive of the Simple Stem from roots with initial *u*, the group **ደው, ትው** &c., is thus, as a rule,

Rejection
of *u* (and *i*)

is certainly inaccurate, for otherwise it would be impossible to understand, why people did not keep to the original way of writing it, viz **ሀለው**. According to TRUMPP, p. 534, it is pronounced *helēu* (= original *helēw*). In the end of a word the doubling is no longer heard.

(1) But v. König, p. 153 [and *cf.* *Kebra Nag.*, p. XVI, *sub* 2.]

(2) *Cf.* with what follows, KÖNIG, p. 105 *sqq.*

simplified into **ደ**, **ት** &c. (although it has kept itself unchanged in isolated cases of Verbs, *e. g.* **ደውጋክ**), thus **ደረድ** from **ወረድ**; **ደደቀ** from **ወደቀ**. While according to § 49 *ew* may easily become *ū* in Nominal formations, the *ě* of the Personal prefixes is in this case held to be so essential in the Verb that a *u*-sound is never admitted; and whereas in Hebrew,—where **וְ** likewise stands for **וְיָ**,—the *w* which falls away is at least replaced by a long vowel, it falls away in Ethiopic just as in Arabic without leaving a trace, so that even in the Imperative and in the Nominal forms derived from the Imperf. (Subj.) the root makes its appearance, deprived of its first letter. In the very same way in Nominal stems from roots with **ወ** as last radical, if they have long *ā* before the last radical, the *u*, hardened into *w* is frequently rejected⁽¹⁾, in order to avoid the by no means favoured group, *āw*. In words with an Adjective meaning, like **ጸዕዳ** or **ጸዐዳ** “white”, Pl. **ጸዓድው**, this course is rarely followed, but it is common in Abstracts, the most of which do not admit a plural, *e. g.* **ሥጋ** “flesh”; **ፍፍ** “way”; **ጸጋ** “favour” &c. (§ 107), and it is almost constant in the type **ተስፋ** “hope”; **ተክኃ** (and **ተክኃ**) “relationship”; **ተድላ** “pleasure” &c. (§ 111), though on the other hand we have **ተክኃዎሙ** Esth. 9, 22, as well as **ተክኃሆሙ**. In like manner it is sometimes thrown out before the closely attached *t* of the Fem., though not quite without compensation, *e. g.* **ዐውያት** “lamentation” (*V***ዐውያው**); **መርዓት** “bride” (*V***ረዐወ**); **ሐማት** “mother-in-law” &c. (§ 128)⁽²⁾. More rarely it may happen that in the beginning of a syllable which is preceded by one that is closed, *u* is thrown out before an *a* or *ā*, which for any reason may be irremovable⁽³⁾. Thus from roots *mediae* **ወ**, instead of the heavy-sounding Causative Stem **አዋተ**, a simpler one is formed with lighter sounds, like **አቀመ** for **አቀወመ**; **አጠቀ** from **ጠቀ**⁽⁴⁾, particularly from those roots which have an Aspirate as third radical, *e. g.* **አንጎ** for **አነጎ**⁽⁵⁾ (§ 45), for **አንወጎ** (v. farther on this point § 96). In this case also the *u* or *w* disap-

(¹) Just as in the Arabic **أَسَفَ**.

(²) It is a totally different case from this, when in the much used archaic words **አብ**, **ዕቅ** &c. the last radical disappears; cf. § 105, *a. f.*

(³) As often happens in Arabic, EWALD, ‘*Gr. Arab.*’ § 109, and in Hebrew, EWALD, § 35, *a.*

(⁴) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 116.

(⁵) [Which itself is still met with: v. *Kelra Nag.*, p. XXVIII *a.*]

pears without leaving a trace;—yet *cf.* § 96, 1. In Nominal formation this is rare; yet an example is found in **ሐሰት** “lie” from **ሐሰወ**, for **ሐሰወት**⁽¹⁾. A few roots *mediae* **ወ**, which have an Aspirate as third radical, transform *ō* in the Subjunctive into *ā* and thus give up the vowel-radical; but this *ā* continues then at least without change (§ 46):—**ይባእ**, **ይማእ** for **ይቦእ**, **ይጥእ** (v. § 93). A like process is shown in cases like **ቃል**: “word” for **ቆል**⁽²⁾, in accordance with § 18.

I or y is much more stable than u or w. The most important case, in which radical *ī* disappears, or rather unites with another *ī*, has been already described (§ 52. p. 98), *e. g.* **ጠሊ**. Otherwise the rejection of *i* or *y* occurs very seldom indeed⁽³⁾. **ዐሥራት** “the tenth part” seems to have come from **ዐሥራይት**, like **ዐውያት** from **ዐውያውት**. We meet with **ብዕራ** “cattle” for **ብዕራይ**, for the sake of the rhyme⁽⁴⁾. **ሥንት** “urine” (*Vulgi*), seems to have come from a Masculine form **ሢን**, of which the *ī* had to be shortened into *ē*, by § 36, in the doubly closed syllable.

The interchange of w and y, which is so common in other Semitic tongues, is exceedingly rare in Ethiopic. True, there are, it seems, many roots originally commencing with *i*, which have passed into roots having an initial **ወ** (§ 68); but after the roots had once been thoroughly formed, those which had *u* and those which had *i* as the first, second, third, or fourth radical, remained sharply distinguished thenceforth, and passed no more into one another in the course of formation. Accordingly, cases like the plural **መራዕይ** from **መርዓት** for **መርዓውት** are few and far between⁽⁵⁾.

It has already been explained (§ 48), that the Aspirate **ኣ**, occurring after an *ī*, passes occasionally into **የ**.

1. CONSONANTS.

§ 54. The Consonants form the more stable, unchangeable part of the sounds of the language. In general they maintain, all through the process of Word-formation, the appearance and

Doubling of Consonant as Result of Assimilation.

(1) Oftener in Arabic, EWALD, ‘*Gr. Arab.*’ § 410.

(2) *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Gr. Arab.*’ §§ 73 and 387. [Better to regard **ቃል** = **قال**

= Assy. *qālu* and **ቆል** = **قُول** = Assy. *qūlu*, as has been already pointed out *supra*, p. 37, Note (1).]

(3) *Cf.* KÖNIG, p. 107.

(4) LUDOLF, ‘*Lex. Aeth.*’, col. 247.

(5) *Cf.* also KÖNIG, p. 107.

order attaching to them when handed over in the fully formed root. The only thorough-going alteration, which the radicals are subjected to in formative processes, is their Doubling,—one of the leading formative devices in the field of Semitic speech. Meanwhile, and apart from this, groups of sounds may be produced by the formative process, which are somewhat difficult to utter, and which therefore almost necessarily involve transitions of sound among the Consonants. Farther, in certain phonetic conditions, individual consonants, especially the softer ones, may gradually become enfeebled, and either disappear entirely or be turned into vowels. And just as consonants may in certain circumstances pass into vowels, so vowels again may avail themselves of the help of consonants, and add to their own strength by bringing them into the word.

1. The Doubling of a Consonant is sometimes given in the root itself, inasmuch as the language possesses a number of roots in which one of the letters is pronounced as a doubled letter:—a more precise account of this phenomenon falls to be given in discoursing of roots. Sometimes again, doubling serves as an expedient in word-formation: an account of this is also deferred to a subsequent part of the work. Finally, Doubling of a Consonant is sometimes produced by another Consonant becoming assimilated to it, and this is the case which calls for detailed description here.

(a) When in any word then Consonants meet together, which in consequence of this encounter are difficult to utter, one of the devices employed by the language to introduce an easier pronunciation is the transferring of one of the two letters to the other, or *the doubling of one Consonant, as a result of the other being made to resemble it (Assimilation)*. Such assimilation of two letters occurs frequently in the formation of roots. In particular the softer letters, *e. g.* Aspirates or Liquids, readily pass over to a stronger consonant, *e. g.* **𐤌𐤍𐤏** *mabbala* “to wield power”, from **𐤌𐤍𐤏𐤏**; **𐤏𐤏𐤏** “to withdraw” *sassala*, from **𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏** &c. (v. *infra* § 71) (1). Otherwise, this phenomenon is limited to a few

(1) Just like **𐤌𐤍𐤏**, PRAETORIUS, ‘*Beitr. z. Assy.*’ I, p. 30 *sqq.* would also understand **𐤏𐤏𐤏**, **𐤏𐤏𐤏**, **𐤏𐤏𐤏**. In the words **𐤏𐤍**, **𐤏𐤏**, **𐤏𐤏**, **𐤏𐤏**, **𐤏𐤏** he sees (*ibid.* p. 28 *sqq.*) a compensatory lengthening, for the disappearance of a doubling produced by the assimilation of **𐤏**, **𐤏** &c.

definite cases. When two Consonants come upon one another, without being separated by a vowel, the one passes over to the other in certain cases. 1. When, in the course of conjugation⁽¹⁾, the Guttural **ḡ** or **ḥ** as radical meets with the **h** of the personal-ending, the latter passes over to the foregoing radical⁽²⁾: **ዐረገ** 'arágga, for **ዐረገከ**; **ጽህቁ** *sehéqqū*, for **ጽህቅኩ**. If, however, the preceding Guttural belongs to the *u*-containing class (§ 26), assimilation is not in favour, just because a kind of vowel then separates the two letters, *e. g.* **ለሐኩኩ**; **ዘንጐጐኩ**; **ኅለቀኅሙ**. Only now and then does assimilation take place, *e. g.* **ለሐኩ**, for **ለሐኩከ**; **ተኅለቁ**, for **ተኅለቀኩ**. Ps. 87,4. 2. The **ጥ** of the formative syllables of the Feminine and of the Reflexive Stem is assimilated to the radical **ጠ** and **ደ**:—**ይደሎ** *yeddalō*, for **ይጥደሎ**; **ይጠመቁ**, for **ይጥጠመቁ**; **ሠየጥ**, for **ሠየጥጥ**; **ዋሕድ**, for **ዋሕድጥ**; **መወልድ**, for **መወልድጥ**; **ትውልድ**, for **ትውልድጥ**; **ዋገድ**, for **ዋገድጥ**. It is only in the words⁽³⁾ **አሐቲ** "one" (*f.*), for **አሐድቲ**, and **ወለት** "daughter", for **ወለድጥ**⁽⁴⁾, that the radical has given way to the formative letter (just as in **ጠገኛ** for **ጥገኛ**). Inasmuch, however, as the Dental Mutes and the Sibilants belong to the same organ of speech, it is not at all remarkable that the combination of letters *ts*, *ds* &c., which is regarded as inadmissible in other languages, should be made easier of pronunciation by the Mute passing over to the Sibilant⁽⁵⁾. Accordingly **ጥ** or **ድ** before a Sibilant passes over to the latter; and in fact the **ጥ** of the Reflexive Stem regularly does so, with every Sibilant: **እሠወጥ**, for **እጥሠወጥ**; **ይሴፈወ**, for **ይጥሴፈወ**; **ይዜከር**, for **ይጥዜከር**; **ይጸሐፍ**, for **ይጥጸሐፍ**; **ትፀመድ**, for **ትጥፀመድ**. **ድ** passes into **ሰ** in **ሰሱ**, for **ሰድሱ** and in **ሰሳ** for **ሰድሳ**, although both letters belong to the root. Apart from these cases the transition of one consonant to another is exceedingly rare. A Nasal has been

(1) This case rarely appears anywhere else. It is true that the same thing apparently is met with in appending a Suffix Pron. of the 2nd pers. to a Noun which ends in a Guttural, but in point of fact the two letters in that case are always kept from touching, by means of the binding-vowel, and no assimilation is possible. On similar appearances in the appending of enclitic particles to the Verb, *v. infra*, §§ 169 and 152.

(2) *Cf.* KÖNIG, p. 97 *sq.*

(3) **ወ-ስተ** seems not to be derived from **ወ-ስጥት**, but from **ወ-ስጥ**, by **ጥ** becoming **ጥ**. [*Cf.* however, Assy. *ištu* (*ultu*).]

(4) V. KÖNIG, p. 97.

(5) Other languages evade the difficulty by the transposition *st*, *sd*.

assimilated to an *l* in አላ “but”, “however”, from አም (አመ, ሲ) and ላ (ሂ, ስኅ)⁽¹⁾.

Doubling
of Conso-
nant, to
make up for
shortening
preceding
Vowel.

§ 55. (b) The device of shortening a long vowel and restoring the length by doubling the following Consonant, is very rarely made use of, except in the case described in § 52. It appears, however, in ከመ- *kémmū* (Suff. Pron. of the 2nd pers. pl.), the first vowel of which was originally long,—although it answers to ك in Arabic,—and accordingly the doubling of the *m* would seem to have been introduced to strengthen the short vowel in the open syllable. On the other hand in አሉ *éllū* “these”, አለ *élla* “who”, “which” (pl.), the doubling appears to have a different origin (v. § 146).

Doubled
Consonant
always
written in
Single
Form.

(c) Whatever may have been the origin of the doubling of any Consonant, the doubled Consonant in Ethiopic is written only in single form. And the script has adhered so faithfully to this principle, that whenever two identical consonants meet together, without a separating vowel between them, whether in forming or in compounding words, only one consonant is written down, *e. g.* ይቲሐት, for ይትቲሐት; ስእነ, for ስእነነ; አስመኩ, for አስመካኩ; ምወት, for ምወትት; አቅስት, for አቅስትት; እምታ, for እም:ምታ; ታግስኑ, for ታግስንኑ; ዋሕድ, *fem.* of ዋሕድ for ዋሕድት; even ወወዳ, for ወወ-ወዳ; (on the other hand አምላካክ *amlākeka*; ጸወንን *šawanéna*; ይነድዱ *yenadedū* &c.)⁽²⁾. Even in foreign words there is no deviation from this mode of writing, *e. g.* ልዳ *Lydda*; ረቢ “Rabbi”; ስማኮስ *Symmachus*. Variations occur only in those cases in which the consonant itself varies from a pronunciation which employs a vowel, to one which discards it. In particular there are cases (§ 37) in which a consonant that should otherwise be uttered with a fugitive *ě* in an open syllable, and which follows an open syllable, gives up its *ě* without difficulty, and, having thus become vowel-less, attaches itself to the preceding syllable. If such consonant is the first element of a consonantal double-letter,—which is often the case in formations from roots *med. gem.*,—both

(¹) [But see Note to § 168, 6.]. The cases of this sort which have been collected by KÖNIG, p. 98, with the exception of አብሒሩ for አምብሒሩ in the RÜPPELL Inscriptions 1, 28; 2, 51 (cf. D. H. MÜLLER, ZDMG XXX, p. 704 [and ‘*Epigr. Denkm.*’, p. 52]), are doubtful. [V. however *Kebra Nag.*, p. XVII, sub 10:—እቤተ=እምቤተ and ኅቤተ=ኅበ:ቤተ.]

(²) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 94 *sqq.*

modes of writing are allowable. It is true that ነደ and ተሰደ are usually written for ነድደ and ተሰድደ, seeing that here the vowel-less pronunciation of the middle letter has thoroughly penetrated the form, and so too with ተምዐ *tamé'-ä*, for ተምዐዐ; but the other mode of writing occurs also. In the very same way ይነዱ, ያነበ, ኅሢ, ኅሥዎ &c. are frequently written for ይነድዱ, ያነበበ, ኅሥሢ, ኅሥሥዎ. Now seeing that no written sign has at any time been contrived (§ 16) to indicate this doubling, it is only from knowledge of the Word-form itself that we can tell when a Consonant has to be read as a double one; and this constitutes a sensible defect in Ethiopic writing, for the beginner in the language. It is still worse that we should in this way be destitute of any ancient external evidence⁽¹⁾ as to those cases in which a consonant is to be uttered as a double one, and that we should therefore be left without guidance, if not in regard to individual types, at all events in regard to individual words, which may belong to the one type or the other.

§ 56. (d) *Giving up the Doubling.* 1. The doubling of a Consonant is audible only when it is followed by a vowel: It cannot be heard at the end of words which do not conclude with a vowel. Originally, it is true, there were no words in Ethiopic which ended with a consonant requiring to be doubled and yet unprovided with a following vowel, for the Nominal stems, which alone are concerned here, ended at one time in *ě*, so that ልብ, *e. g.*, was pronounced *lébb^e* (§ 38). But this *ě* was given up at an early stage, and then of course cases emerged in abundance, in which a concluding double letter could only make itself heard as a single one, *e. g.* ልብ *léb*; ሕግ *hég*,—although in such words the double letter was at once heard, as soon as it was followed by a vowel, as in ልበ *lebba*, ሕግከ *héggeka*.

2. In the middle of a word the doubling, particularly of Semivowels and Aspirates, may in certain circumstances more easily

⁽¹⁾ The later pronunciation, as it was heard by LUDOLF, is by no means invariably the correct one. LUDOLF also propounded several decidedly erroneous views on this point, seemingly founded on his peculiar grammatical opinions, as will be farther proved.—According to TRUMPP, p. 522, N. 1, the doubling of Consonants (with the exception of the Aspirates) is still heard to some extent in Ge'ez in the middle of a word, but is invariably given up at the end of it. Cf. also KÖNIG, p. 117 sq.

disappear. On the Semivowels⁽¹⁾ *cf. supra*, p. 97 *sq.*, § 52: cases like **መይጥ** *maït*, properly *mayyet*, belong to this section, as well as **ሙታን**, for **ሞውታን** *meww^{et}tān*. In other cases we have the same thing; for instance **የሐውዱ** (from **የሐውድ**) *yahawwešū* may no doubt become, when somewhat carelessly pronounced, *yahawšū*, *yahaušū*. Gutturals too occasionally cast away the embarrassing doubling. Thus it comes about, that an *á* which has the tone, and which comes before a doubled Aspirate followed by short *ě* in a closed syllable, as in **ይመህር** *yemáhher* “(that) he teach”, is thickened into *e*, as in **ይሞህር**,—an indication that the doubling is no longer clearly heard (§ 45),—and that this *yeméhher* is farther reduced to *yeméhr* (§ 46). Farther, a certain dislike to the doubling of Aspirates can alone explain why some verbs, having a middle Aspirate, should in the Causative of the Intensive Stem,—in all those forms in which a doubling of the second radical would have to be audible (Perf., Subj., Imperf., Inf.),—have recourse to the Causative of the Simple Stem, *e. g.* **አትሐተ**; **አልዐለ**, as well as **አለዐለ** (*cf.* § 96). In the same way a still larger number of verbs *middle Aspirate* prefer to adopt, in the Perfect (and to some extent in the Infinitive) of the Reflexive Stem, the form **ተትሐተ**, *tatehta*, instead of the form **ተተሐተ**, that is to say, the form of Reflexive 1, in preference to that of Reflexive 2;—or at least they admit of both forms side by side (*v.* § 97). But we cannot follow up this question of the doubling of Aspirates farther than these few hints, seeing that the means of gaining acquaintance with the old pronunciation are wanting.

3. In the cases mentioned hitherto, the doubling disappears without any compensation for its loss, but in other cases it is made up for in one way or other. There is the case,—isolated, so far as yet known,—of the doubling of a radical (in a double-lettered root) being thrown back on the first radical, in the word **ተምዐ**, **ተማዕከ** for **ተምዐዐ**, **ተመዓዕከ** &c. (§ 97). Of almost equally rare occurrence is the device of compensating for the doubling, by lengthening the preceding vowel⁽²⁾, *e. g.* **ሚያኔ** “delusion”, for **ምያኔ** *meyyānē*; **ዲፓ** “ambush”, **ከፓፓ**; **ተባረዘ** = **تَبَرَّزَ**; and in foreign words, *e. g.*

(1) *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, § 64 *a.*

(2) Common in Hebrew and still more frequent in Syriac. *Cf.* also KÖNIG, p. 416. [It will perhaps be wise to receive with a measure of caution the instances which follow in this paragraph, as some of them seem rather forced and doubtful. TR.]

መርቁሉክ *Marcellus* ⁽¹⁾. Oftener the first element of a double letter is softened into a Semivowel, which then coalesces with a foregoing *a* into a mixed vowel, as happens in several Multiliteral roots (v. § 78). Only, in the Imperfects of all the Intensive Stems, in consequence of lengthening the immediately preceding vowel *ä* into *ā*, the doubling of the middle radical is regularly given up, and in compensation an *i*-sound is blended with the *ā*, *e. g.* **ዩፌረም** *yefēṣem*, from **ዩፌጽም** *yefāṣsem* (§ 95). A third method of replacing the doubling, and one of very frequent occurrence, consists in interpolating a Liquid: *cf.* § 72.

§ 57. 2. To facilitate the pronunciation of difficult letter-groups, there are still other expedients at the command of the language, besides the Assimilation of two Consonants,—in particular, (1) exchanging them for others, and (2) transposing them.

Exchange
of Conso-
nants.
Transpo-
sition.

Exchanging one Consonant for another is, upon the whole, of rare occurrence ⁽²⁾. A **ዝ**, meeting directly with **ት** may easily assume the sound of **ከ**, and in fact,—although it is retained, as a rule, *e. g.* in **ወሓይዝት** “rivers”,—it has passed into **ከ** in several words in very common use. This is the case invariably in **ኅብስት** “bread”, for **ኅብዝት**, and sometimes in **ኦጋክስት** “lords”, for—or as a companion-form to—**ኦጋክዝት**. Probably also a **ጥ** has been weakened into **ት** after **ከ** in the common word **ውስት** ⁽³⁾. **ም**, when it meets directly with Labial Mutes, frequently passes into the Dental Nasal:—**ኣንበይ** “because of”, for **ኣምበይ**; **ኣንበለ** “except”, for **ኣምበለ** (although one always says **ኣምብሔር**, **ኣምብርት** ⁽⁴⁾ &c.); **ለንጳስ** *λαμπάς*, **ለንጲኔ** *λαμπήννη*; **ምንባሬ** *Μαμβρη*, Gen. 14, 24; 18, 1; and a like result happens more than once when it comes upon a Dental Mute: **ጉንድ** “stem”, from **ጥንፎ**; **ስንዳሌ** *σεμίδαλις*; and so too, no doubt, in **መንታ** “twins”, for **መምታ** from **ጠጽታ** ⁽⁵⁾. In Ethiopic the transposition of Consonants does not appear in Word-formation, for *ts* does not become *st*, but *ss*,—v. § 54 ⁽⁶⁾. But certainly Ethiopic roots, when compared

⁽¹⁾ Verbs, like **ሳረረ**, **ባረከ**, I do not regard as Intensive Stems (in the way of **ገገገ**), but rank them rather with Stem 3.

⁽²⁾ *Cf.* KÖNIG, p. 100 *sq.* ⁽³⁾ [But *cf. supra*, p. 103, Note ⁽³⁾.]

⁽⁴⁾ [V. however *supra*, p. 104, Note ⁽¹⁾.]

⁽⁵⁾ **ኣስጳዳጦስ** for *ἀσπάλαδος* is explained by the Greek uncial writing (Δ having been read as Δ).

⁽⁶⁾ *Cf.*, however, **ኣምርሕት** and **ኣምሕርት**; **ኣፍርኅት** and **ኣፍኅርት**;

with the corresponding ones in the related tongues, present many examples of the transposition of letters, *e. g.* መትከፍት “shoulder”, for መከተፍት (ካከፍ); አርመስመስ, for አምረስመስ from መርሰሰ, ሠሠዞ; መጥቅፅ, from مَقَطْع; አንገለገ (= አንገልገ) for አንገልገል; ለዐለ *lá'-a-la*, for ዐልዐለ; ሐቀፈ. ፆፐገ, حبك; ጸገበ, شبع. In particular it is the more liquid letters and the Aspirates, which tend in Ethiopic root-formation to glide from one position to another:—Examples for **A**:—ሠሀለ, ስሌ, سهل; ጸሕል, ጸክረኝ; ወለጠ, بدل; ሐቅል, ፆከ, ፆከ, حَقْل; ለምጽ, ملص and ملص:—for **C**:—ወረድ “breadth”, ፕዳ; ሕንብርብሬ, ፐፓ, جَرَب; ፈገፈ, فرع (فهر):—for **T**:—ሐነጸ, حصن, ስገ;—for Aspirates besides:—ሰንአ, ጸሠ, حل; ናእከ, “lead”, ጸፋ, انك; ናእከ “groaning”, ፆፋ, ፆፋ; ፈሐቀ, ፆፐ, انك; ለስሐ, لسكر; ሐሰለ, سكل. In one or two roots all the letters are shifted together:—ምሕረ, ስገ, رحم⁽¹⁾; ልሀቀ, ስከ, كهل; perhaps too in አግር “foot”, from ልግር⁽²⁾, ፐፓ, رجل; መርግ, رَجَام. For details in these cases reference may be made to the Lexicon.

Inter-
polation or
Rejection of
individual
Consonants.

§ 58. 3. *Interpolation, or Rejection, of individual Consonants, and Softening of Consonants into Vowels.* In the first place a short vowel with the tone, in an open syllable, may be strengthened by the insertion of a Nasal: thus ዝንቱ *zéntü*, “this”, stands for ዝቱ; ህየንተ *heyánta*, “instead of”, for ህየተ, which still appears along with it; ዙለንታ; for ዙለታ; አንባ for አባ; ሰንበልት, ሰንቢል, along with ሰብል (KÖNIG, p. 102); ድንቀት “chance”, for ድቀት; *cf.* also መንጠንጢን “petty”, from ህመጠን; ልዙትንት *lekuetént*,

ማዕበል and መብዕል; መቋዕልት and መቋልዕት; ተምክሦት for ተምእኮት; and ተምክእት for ተምእክት; ርሕስት and ርስሕት; መስእርት for ማእስርት; ትዕውርት for ትውዕርት; ትውዝፍት for ትዝውፍት; አግልዕት and አግልልት; እግዚእ and አጋእዝት; ይትመሀቱ for ይትመትሁ ‘*Gadla Adām*’ (ed. TRUMPF), p. 79, l. 24.—On the question whether the prefix of the Causative-Reflexive,—አስተ has been transposed from አትሰ, v. § 83.

(¹) But v. PRAETORIUS, ‘*Beitr. z. Ass.*’, I, p. 21.—*Cf.* Arab. رَظْل, from Greek ῥαπα.

(²) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ p. 91; SCHRADER, ‘*De Indole*’, p. 24; KÖNIG, p. 144.

λήκυθος; **𐤌𐤍𐤍**, *μηχανή*⁽¹⁾. But just as a short vowel may in such a case be strengthened also by doubling the following consonant (§ 55)⁽²⁾, so may a Nasal in turn make its way into a word to compensate for giving up the doubling of the consonant (§ 56). This phenomenon, which is quite usual in Aramaic as is well known, is shown in Ethiopic, just as in Arabic⁽³⁾,—mainly however in root-formation, though in this case, of very common occurrence,—by a **ን** coming in after the first radical, probably to replace the doubling of the second radical (for examples v. § 72). In the word **𐩈𐩢𐩣** Deut. 32, 15, we have, alongside of this original form, the variation **𐩈𐩢𐩣𐩈**. Of foreign words there may be compared, *e. g.* **𐩈𐩢𐩣** *σάπφειρος*. With less frequency a **ር** is interpolated for a like purpose in root-formation: **𐩈𐩣𐩈𐩢** *Gallus*; **𐩈𐩣𐩈𐩢𐩈** *Tabennesis* (cf. *infra* § 72)⁽⁴⁾. In Syriac and Arabic this practice is more common.

The rejection of a Consonant without any compensation is similarly infrequent in Ethiopic⁽⁵⁾. The Nasal **ን** is the letter most liable to be so treated, *e. g.* **𐩈𐩢𐩣** for **𐩈𐩢𐩣𐩈** before the Semi-vowel, or as a final letter after a long vowel, as in the numerals from 20 to 90 (§ 158) and in the Pronominal terminations (*e. g.* § 146). An entire syllable, viz. **ን**, (**ን** along with its vowel), is thrown off from **𐩈𐩢** “from”, when it has to be closely attached to the Noun. And just like **ን**, the Liquid **ለ** is constantly rejected after a long vowel in a word which is in very frequent use, viz. **ይ** “he said”, for **ይ-ሰላ** (cf. *supra*, § 46)⁽⁶⁾. The Fem. **ት** disappears, just as in Aramaic, in the terminations *ō*, *ē* (for *ōt*, *ēt*), § 120 *sq.* On the rejection of Aspirates and Semi-vowels cf. §§ 47 and 53. Occasionally too, in forms where several radicals are repeated, a letter is left out for brevity’s sake.

The softening of any one of the firmer letters into a vowel is still less common, and has mostly been handed down in very ancient words, like **ቅከብ** “star”, from **ከብከብ**. Cf. also § 28, on **ብ**.

Softening
of Conso-
nants into
Vowels.

(1) In Amharic, *e. g.* **አንድ** “one”, for **አድ** from **አሐድ**.

(2) Cf. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, § 9 *sq.*

(3) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Arab.*’, §§ 163, 191.

(4) Cf. also KÖNIG, p. 103.

(5) Cf. KÖNIG, pp. 101, 103.

(6) Cf. also GESENIUS, ‘*Thesaurus*’, p. 600.

III. THE WORD AND THE TONE OF THE WORD.

The Tone
of the
Word, and
its Adjust-
ment.

§ 59. The word, consisting of several syllables, has a unity impressed upon it by means of the Tone, which brings one syllable into prominence as the one which dominates the whole. The pronunciation of the other syllables is then accommodated to this leading syllable, as regards length or shortness, height or depth of note, and even, in certain circumstances, choice of vowels for these syllables. Although the influence of the Tone upon the vocalisation of the word by no means displays itself in forms so manifold in Ethiopic, as, for instance, in Hebrew, it nevertheless asserts itself now and then, and therefore it calls for a short description here.

1. It is true that the method of fixing the tone of the word⁽¹⁾,—in a dead language which has left no grammatical description belonging to the time when it was a living tongue, and which did not employ in its written character any tone-marking⁽²⁾,—can no longer be exactly determined in detail; but the general principles of the process may be gathered, partly from the rules of word-formation, and partly from later accounts of the accentuation⁽³⁾, and from a comparison of Ethiopic with Arabic and Amharic. According to these principles the Tone is not bound to any special syllable, as it is in Hebrew, in such manner that it should fall, as a rule say, on the last syllable, or possibly on the penult; but on the contrary in any polysyllable,—so far as mere possibility goes,—it may rest on any one of the last three syllables, and occasionally may lie, it would seem, still farther back, *e. g.* **በረከተ** *báarakata*; **በረከተከ** *báarakàtaka*. The adjustment of the tone is regulated by wholly different points of view. In the first place it depends upon the kind of syllables and their vowels. Syllables having long vowels,—or (which is the same thing as a matter of prosody) closed

(¹) Cf. now specially, on this subject, the frequently quoted treatise of TRUMPF, '*Ueber den Accent im Aethiopischen*', ZDMG XXVIII, p. 515 *sqq.*: v. also KÖNIG, p. 154 *sqq.*—On the marked fluctuation of the tone in present-day Abyssinian, *e. g.* in Tigrña, v. PRAETORIUS ZDMG XLI, p. 688 [and in Tigre, LUTTMANN, '*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*' XIII, p. 140 *sqq.*].

(²) The signs written over the several words in Ethiopic Hymnologies are certainly not Tone-marks, but musical signs, apparently formed in imitation of Greek notes of Music.

(³) LUDOLF, '*Gramm.*' I, 7.

syllables having short vowels,—naturally assert themselves in the word, and necessarily attract the tone, in opposition to open syllables with short vowels, *e. g.* ካዳት *hedāt*; ነገር *nagárna*. The second fundamental rule, which, besides, is connected with the formative history of words, is this,—that final short vowels, belonging invariably to the form, and final and simply closed syllables which have short vowels, and which have originated from the rejection of a final vowel in pronunciation (*e. g.* ሀገር *hágar*, for *hágar^e*), do not take the tone; while final long vowels also surrender the tone to the penult, when the penult has a long vowel (thus, of course ይበሉ *yebalí*; ይተረኙ *yetfannó*; ነገሩ *nagarú*; but ይበሉ *yebélū*; ጥቱ *mótū*; ይጠጡ *yemítū*; ይረዝዩ *yeré'yū*; ይሰሩ *yeséfō*; ፈጣሪ *fatáři*; ጠጥረው *medráwī* &c.). Evidently in most cases the tone avoids the last syllable. Much oftener it rests on the third last syllable, but oftenest on the second last. For the rest, the accentuation of a word is regulated by the nature of its formation, because it is only from this that we can see what vowels and syllables are the most important in the word, what formative additions are attached bearing the tone, and what ones have given up their tone,—why, for instance, ገበር “act”, (Imper.) is pronounced *gebár*, but ሀገር: “city”, *hágar*; why መሳፍንት “princes” should be *masáfent*, but ፍጥርት „created” (fem.) *feťért*; ውሕቱ “he”, *wétū*, and ገብሩ “they acted”, *gabrú*, &c.⁽¹⁾. Accordingly, instead of reckoning up a series of rules on accentuation at this stage, it will be more advisable to give the accentuation of the several forms when we come to describe them. Still, reference may be again made here to § 48, according to which the Aspirates exercise a peculiar influence on the tone.

Ethiopic has a large number of small monosyllabic words, which are too weak to take a position for themselves in the sentence. They are therefore attached to stronger words as prefixes or suffixes; but, like the enclitics of other tongues, they are then unaccented, or only so far accented as to make them discernible to the ear as loosely connected appendages, which do not belong properly to the word. They cause no alteration in the main accent-

(1) [Without going into particulars it may be said here generally that TRUMPF and KÖNIG are probably safer guides than DILLMANN in the pronunciation of Ethiopic, when the last-named differs from the first two, as he frequently does. TR.]

uation of the word; and yet, according to LUDOLF, in words which end in a long vowel, the tone must necessarily fall upon this long vowel before an appended particle, even though it did not rest on this vowel in the word when standing alone: *ṣṣṭ- mánū*, but *ṣṣṭ-ṣṣ manūma*; *ʔ-ṭ yōgī*, but *ʔ-ṭḥ yōgīkē*. *ḥ* “this (*m.*)” and *ḥ* “this (*f.*)” differ from these attached particles, for though they are mostly attached, in writing, to the word which follows them, they still retain their own independent tone.

Nothing is known in Ethiopic of any special pronunciation of a word at the end of a sentence or at the end of a clause of a sentence, and nothing, accordingly, of any influence being exerted by the accent of the sentence upon the accent of a word (*Pause*). LUDOLF expressly notices that the Abyssinians modulate their voices very little in reading.

Vocalisa-
tion of the
Word, as in-
fluenced by
the Tone.

§ 60. 2. The vocalisation of a word mainly depends, of course, not on phonetic conditions, but on the sense and signification of its own form,—so far as different significations cling to different vowels, as will be shown farther on. And yet phonetic conditions exercise an influence too; for the sense of the form is usually sustained in any word by one vowel only, or by two at most; the selection of the rest depends upon phonetic conditions, and that selection is made in such fashion that the several syllables in the word all sound harmoniously together, and the toneless syllables subordinate themselves to the tone-bearing ones according to their situation with respect to the latter. As regards, first of all, the long vowels, they appear, with some few exceptions, to be essential in Ethiopic to the signification in the forms concerned. The short vowels, *ā* and *ē*,—and particularly *ā*,—seem possessed, it is true, of the same property, in the case of many forms, but they are often mere auxiliary vowels, employed to facilitate the pronunciation of consonants which are not supported by the formative vowel or vowels. Of the two, *ē* is the more unimportant, indefinite and colourless; *ā* is more important and significant, and accordingly, as a mere auxiliary vowel, it is employed specially in the Noun. Farther it appears that when once *ā* or *ē* has established itself in a form, the other syllables readily echo⁽¹⁾ the vowel concerned; thus,

(1) For another example of a foregoing vowel recurring in the next syllable as an echo, v. § 26, 4.

both in the Perfect of Verbs and in Quadriliteral and Multiliteral Nouns the *ǎ* often runs through several syllables:—**ነጉድጓድ**, **ነቀልቃል**, **ደገደገ**; or *ě* in **ቀንጽል**, **ድልቅልቅ**, **ድንበኩል**. To precede *ū*, *ě* is preferred, **ግብር**, **እስትጉቡእ**, and *ǎ* to precede *ī*, **ጠቢብ**. But if a long *ā*, as the weightiest of all the vowels, has newly made its way into the stem, the syllable before or after it must as far as possible be shortened and obscured, and so it is not *ǎ* that appears in it, but *ě*: **ዕረቅ**, **ሕንባል**, **ምሕዋር**, **ትርጋሪ**, **ምሳሌ**, **ኃጥእ**, **መፃትም**, **ሰናሰል**, **መማከርት**. In certain cases, in fact, before such an *ā*, even an *ā*, *ō* or *ē* must be eased down into a *ū* or *ī* at least:—**ጉባኤ**, **ዒዋዌ**. The same rule holds also, when a tone-bearing *ā*, or a formative syllable with *ā*, is attached to the stem as the main syllable of the word: **ፍሥሐ**, **ርሥእን**, **ብኩርና**. Even a mere strongly accented *á*, which is pressing newly into the stem as the bearer of the signification, calls for an obscured *ě* either before or after it:—**ይጉብር**, **እዘን**, **እበን**. On the other hand an *ě* is now and again obliged, through the influence of the tone, to pass into *ǎ*. Invariably is this the case when, in the Perfect of the type **ገብረ** and **ተገብረ**, the tone falls upon the syllable which begins with the second radical; for although **ገበርክ** *gabérka* is capable of pronunciation, the *ě* is yet regarded as too weak here to be retained in the main syllable emphasised by the tone, and therefore it is preferred to replace it by the stronger *ǎ*. In the same way the long *ī* of a tone-bearing syllable,—which is becoming a doubly closed syllable from being a singly closed one, so that its *ī* is necessarily shortened by § 35 sq.—does not always pass into *ě*, but sometimes into *á*, as perhaps in **ሰንቢል**, **ሰንቢልት**; although in similar cases an *é*, shortened out of *ū*, is regarded as regular, like **ፍጥርት**, out of **ፍጡር**⁽¹⁾.

(1) For an account of these conditions, differing from the above, v. KÖNIG, p. 121 sqq.

PART SECOND.

MORPHOLOGY.

A. ROOTS:—THEIR CLASSES, AND THEIR FORMS.

§ 61. Roots are the material out of which Language fashions Words. To explain the mode of their origin and their significations in detail, is the province of the Lexicon. Grammar takes these as given, but it is bound to furnish a survey of the different classes of roots and their forms, because the mode of formation of the words, which have sprung from the roots, is determined by the form of the roots. In accordance with their signification, Roots fall into three classes of very unequal extent.

Inter-
jections.

1. The lowest stage of roots is formed by those *Interjections*, which are not derived from Pronouns or Conceptional Roots, but which burst forth as a direct expression of feeling, and are, as it were, the animal utterances of Man. They are mostly short and unbending; and in their case the distinction between root, and formation from the root, falls away. There are, however, only a very few of them in any language. The most common of these ejaculations is **አ**: “O!”⁽¹⁾, employed to express emotion, and particularly wonder, *e. g.* **አዘመንክር** “O what a marvellous thing!”: It is therefore often used in accosting any one in the Vocative, § 142, **አገብር** “O man!” It seems also to be involved in **አሆ** “Oh! certainly”, v. § 62. As ejaculations of distress and pain there appear:—**ክ**⁽²⁾, in combination with **አ**: as **አአ ፊ ፊ** Numb. 24, 23;

(¹) **ዐ**; **ከ**, **ከ**; **ከከ**, **ከ**.

(²) **ከ**; **ከከ**.

ኢህ⁽¹⁾ “Ah!”; **ደ** and **ዮ**⁽²⁾ “Alas!”. In more frequent use is **ወደ**⁽³⁾ “woe!”, always with a following **ለ** of the dative, e. g. **ወደ ለተ** “woe’s me!”; and, with like meaning, the longer form **ኢሌ**⁽⁴⁾, also with a following dative; finally **ሰደለ** or **ሌለ**, with a following Suff. Pron., “ah! alas!” (for these last three v. *infra*, § 199). A secondary form **ወደለ** to **ወደ**, or **ኢሌለ** to **ኢሌ**, is not necessary to be assumed (§ 167); and yet, just as in Arabic **يَل** has been formed out of **يَ**, so too in Ethiopic a noun **ወደሌ** “howling”, “lamentation”, has sprung from **ወደ** and the **ለ** which invariably follows it. Besides, we meet with **ኢሂ** “come!” (Ex. 4,19; var **ነሂ**), **ባሕ**, **ባሕ**, with a following Suff. Pron., as a particle of salutation, —Arab. **بَح**, **بَح**; and **ጸጥ** as a call to silence.

§ 62. 2. The *Pronominal Roots* are one stage higher. They are no longer confined to the field of sensation, but belong to that of the understanding. They do not, however, themselves denote the objects of conception and thought, but only point out these objects in space and time (Indicating-words); and starting from this they are employed, farther, to denote all possible conditions of thought. They constitute quite as important a part of the language as the Conceptual Roots. If the latter contain the material of the language, the type is furnished by the former; and nearly all the formative additions to words, and the majority of the particles which serve to express the relations of clauses in a sentence, are of pronominal origin. Ethiopic has developed this portion of the language, precisely, in a very rich and manifold way, and has preserved much that has been lost in the other Semitic tongues.

Pronominal
Roots :- De-
monstra-
tives.

(1) Of these Pronominal roots, the most widely extended and most variously employed are the *Demonstratives*, in the narrower sense of the term (*Demonstrativa*). In this class we distinguish four orders of roots.

(a) The primordial Demonstrative *ta*⁽⁵⁾ has been softened into *da*; and then, through transformation of the Mute into the

(1) V. LUDOLF, ‘Comm. Hist. Aeth.’, p. 41.

(2) V. LUDOLF, ‘Lex. Aeth.’, col. 484; Arabic **يَا** in a different meaning.

(3) **ወደ**, **ወደ**, **ወደ**, **ወደ**.

(4) **ኢሌ**. (5) **ተ**, **ሐ**.

Sibilant, the two farther modes of expression *sa* and *za* have been evolved. All the four are represented in Ethiopic. The elementary *ta*, besides appearing in the Feminine termination **ተ**⁽¹⁾, is still preserved in the Personal particles **ቱ**⁽²⁾ and **ቲ** “the” (*m. & f.*), though only in compounds, *e. g.* **ውእቱ**, **ይእቲ**, **ዝንቱ**, **ዛቲ**, **ሎቱ**, **ላቲ**, **እሙንቱ**—, as well as in the Interrogative **ኣይቲ** “where?”. The softer form of pronunciation *da*, which has become predominant in Aramaic, can only be supported in Ethiopic by the preposition **ዲበ** “upon” (§ 165). Having passed into the harder Sibilant⁽³⁾, it has, under the guise of **ሰ**, produced a series of particles of relation and of exclamation, namely, **ሰ** **ዕዳ**, **እስመ** “for” (*conj.*), **ሶበ** “when”, **ሶ** and **እስኩ** “pray, do—!” (*Gr.* **ῥή**, *Lat.* *quaeso*). Just as in Hebrew and Arabic, it has become predominant, under the form of the soft sibilant, for the usual Demonstr. Pron. **ዝ** “this”, and for the Relative Pron. **ዘ** “who” (§ 64), as well as in the particles **ዝየ** „here”, **ማእዚ** “when?”, **ይእዚ** “now”, and perhaps also in **ኒዚ** “point of time”, “hour”.

(b) The root **ተ**, or **ደ**, has become **ሀ**, through a farther subtilising of the Mute into a mere breathing⁽⁴⁾. As such, having been shortened out of the **ቱ** which has been fashioned into a Personal Pron. (§ 65), it makes its appearance in the Suff. Pron. **ሁ**, **ሃ**, **ሆሙ**, **ሆን**; elsewhere, only in Adverbial formation, in particular in **ሃ** as a mark of the Accusative; **ሁ** as an interrogative; **ሂ** “away to” (§ 160); **ሂ** **ጥ፩**, “also”; **ሀየ** “there”; **ሀየንተ** “in place of”; doubtless also in **ኣሆ** “oh! certainly” (properly, “oh! quite so”; *cf.* § 61). And, remarkably enough (§ 24), this aspirate **ሀ** is hardened, in Ethiopic, even into **ሐ** and **ኀ** in **ኀበ** “with” and “where” (§ 161)⁽⁵⁾, and **ከሐ** “away yonder”, **ከሐከ** “yonder”; and into **ዐ** perhaps, in **ዐን** “behold!” (but *v.* § 41).

(c) Like the Mute and and Sibilant Dentals, the two Liquids *n* and *l* also serve to form Demonstrative Pronouns, with either a preceding or a succeeding vowel, as *na*, *an*⁽⁶⁾, *la*, *al*, and they are

⁽¹⁾ [V. on this subject C. BROCKELMANN, ‘*Die Femininendung T im Semitischen*’ (Breslau 1903).]

⁽²⁾ *Cf.* TRUMPP, p. 546, N. 2: [V. also BEZOLD, ‘*Die grosse Darius-inschrift*’, p. 25 *sqq.*; BARTH, ZDMG, XLVI, p. 685 *sqq.*, and LIX, p. 161 *sq.*; FISCHER, *ibid.* p. 443 *sqq.*] ⁽³⁾ *Cf.* **ወሃ**. ⁽⁴⁾ *Cf.* **ፌ**, **ፍ**.

⁽⁵⁾ [*Cf.*, however, PRAETORIUS, ZDMG, LVII, p. 272].

⁽⁶⁾ These two are also extensively used in Sanskrit.

still frequently employed in the Ethiopic language. The *first branch*, and first of all in the form **ኃ**, is employed in Semitic generally, and accordingly in Ethiopic too, mainly to form delicate circumstantial particles which express relations either sensible or intellectual⁽¹⁾. From it proceed on the one hand the words for “behold!”⁽²⁾ **ኃሁ**, **ኃዋ**, **ኃያ**, (§ 160) and for “come now!”⁽³⁾ **ኃዐ**, and on the other hand a few enclitic particles, which closely resemble in form and meaning those which come from the root **ሀ**, namely **ኃ** as an interrogative, **ኃ** “away to” (§ 160), **ኃ** “away to” (§ 160), and **ኃ** “also” (“again”). In the form **ኣኃ**, modified into **ኣኃ**, this branch serves partly to form Personal pronouns, in the Feminines of Demonstrative and Relative pronouns, **ኣኃትኩ**, and **ኣኃታከቲ** “that” (f.), **ኣኃተ** “who” (f.) (§ 64), and as the first element in the Pronouns of the 1st and 2nd Persons (§ 65), and partly to form various particles, like **ኣኃ** “there!” “see!” (in **ኣኃከሙ**, **ኣኃቋዕ**, **ኣኃከ**, **ኣኃጋ**); **ኣኃተ** “with respect to”; **ኣኃዘ** “while”, “since”. As a Demonstrative it seems originally to refer, in opposition to *ta* and *ha*, to the more distant object, and thus to signify “that”; and, seeing that it points away from what is at hand and existing, words which express negation⁽⁴⁾ could at the same time be derived from it. Like the Hebrew **אין**, **אין** in fine, the Ethiopic **ኣኃ** “not”, in compounds like **ኣኃዳሂ** “perhaps” (§ 163) and **ኣኃብደ** “I may not”, is also traceable to this root; and the usual Ethiopic word for “not”, **ኣ** (cf. Assyr. **אין** *ai*) has been shortened out of a form like **אין**.

The *second branch* also, *la*, *al*⁽⁵⁾, had originally the faculty of pointing to the more remote object, although it has not preserved this more definite meaning in all its formations. In Ethiopic **ለ** still occurs with a personal meaning, particularly in the reduplicated form **ለለ** “he, he”, “even he”, “he himself”, “self”, § 150⁽⁶⁾; and **ኣለ** in the same way is found in the compound **ኣለኩ**, **ኣለኩቱ** “those”; while *al* and *la* together, compounded into *alla*, appear in

(1) Cf. TRUMPP, ‘Sitzber. d. philos.-philol. Cl. d. bayer. Akad. zu München vom 5. Mai, 1877’, Part 2, p. 117 sqq.

(2) **ኃኃ**, **ኃ**; **ኃ**.

(3) **ኃኃ**; **ኃ**; **ኃ**.

(4) Like **ኣ** “not”, **ኣኃ** “other”.

(5) **ለ**; **ለ**, **ለለ**, **ለለለ**; **ለለ**; **ለለ**.

(6) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 550, N. 2 (contrary to PRAETORIUS, ZDMG XXVII, p. 639).

the plural stem,—running through all Semitic tongues,—of the Demonstrative Pronoun **አሉ**, **አለ** “these”, as well as of the Relative Pronoun **አለ** “who, which”. And just as from the branch *an*, so too from the branch *la*, *al*, negatives are derived, especially **አል**⁽¹⁾ “not”, in **አለሉ** “there is not”, and **ላ**⁽²⁾ “not”, in **አላ** “but”⁽³⁾.

(d) As the original meaning of the roots formed with *l* and *n* has gradually become weak, the new Demonstrative root **h** has been fashioned, to indicate that which is more remote. In the form *ka* it is contained in the adverbs **ከሐ** “away yonder”, **ከሐከ** “yonder”. To form Personal Demonstratives it is appended, under the form **ከ**, to other Demonstrative roots, in order to bestow upon them the faculty of pointing to that which is more remote: **ኸከ** “that” (*m.*), **አንጎከ** “that” (*f.*), **አልከ** “those”. This Demonstrative root can hardly be regarded as one which has sprung from the Interrogative Relative root (§ 63), but it seems⁽⁴⁾, like the **h** of the 2nd pers. (§ 65), to have come from original *ta*, *twa*.

For a last Demonstrative v. finally § 65, treating of the Personal Pronouns.

§ 63. (2) *Interrogatives* may of course spring from Demonstrative roots like **ሁ** and **ኑ**, through the influence of the tone (§ 62). But as the influence of the tone does not suffice for the formation of all Interrogatives, languages have produced special Interrogative Roots.

(a) In Semitic, and accordingly in Ethiopic, the most usual Interrogative root is *ma* (probably hardened out of *wa*)⁽⁵⁾. In this short form it is still retained (though no longer invariably interrogative in signification, but brought down sometimes to the level of indefiniteness and relativity), in the attached particle **መ** (§ 162), as second member of compounds, in **ሚመ** “*utrum?*” (and **ወሚመ** “*an?*”), **ከመ** “*nearly?*”⁽⁶⁾, **ከመ** “*as?*”⁽⁷⁾, and as first member in **ሚአዚ** “*when?*”⁽⁸⁾. In order to turn *ma* into a Personal Interrogative, it was compounded with the Demonstrative stem *na*: **መኑ** “what (is)

(1) ኣሉ.

(2) ኣላ; ን; ህ.

(3) [Cf. however, § 168, 6, Note].

(4) Cf. **أَلَيْك**, **إِلَيْكَ**; **ከከ**, **ከከከ**, **ከከከከ**.

(5) As the remains of original *kwa* **ክ** *quis?* (v. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, § 104).

(6) ከከመ.

(7) ከከመ; ከከመ.

(8) ከከመ; ከከመ; ከከመ.

he?", "who?"⁽¹⁾, — whence also the neuter **ሞንት** "what?". A neuter and adverbial form **ሚ** "what?" "how!" appears to be a corruption of a form like **ራ**, **ሞ**, **ሞ**, — no longer retained in Ethiopic. A few other particles also, of a relative meaning, have been derived from this **ሞ** (v. § 64).

(b) The second of the most usual Interrogative roots is **ኣይ**⁽²⁾, probably a weakened form of original *kai* (كَيْفَ). It is used in Ethiopic, just as in Arabic, as an interrogative adjective, in the sense *ποῖος*, *qualis*, "of what sort?". Either in the short form *ě* or in the complete form *ai*, it is prefixed to several Demonstrative particles and even to one Conceptional root, to impart interrogative force to them: **ኣይቲ** "where?", **ኣይፎ** "how?"⁽³⁾, **ኣስፍንቱ** "how much?" "how many?".

(c) Both of these Interrogative roots in common use point to an original root *kwa*, *kai*. And there actually appear to be some remains of it, even in Ethiopic, in the interjection አንቋሪ “well now!”, properly:—“see what!”, where the *k* has at the same time passed into the strongest guttural. But in other cases, just as in the other Semitic languages, the Interrogative root, even in this original form, has assumed a Relative meaning throughout.

§ 64. (3) As in other languages, the *Relative Pronouns* are derived from the Demonstratives and Interrogatives.

(a) The ordinary Relative Pronouns are taken from Demonstrative roots, viz. **н** "who, which" (*m.*); **хзт** "who, which" (*f.*), **хл** "who, which" (*pl.*), as well as the conjunctions **н** "that", "in order that"; **хзн** "while" ("seeing that"), and the prepositions **хзт** "with regard to"; **нхзт** "because of". Also, under the form **н** this demonstrative root is employed with a Relative sense in **нн** "when" (with appended **н**, while **н** perhaps corresponds to **н̄, н̄̄**).

(b) From the Interrogative root *ma* there came, with the help of a prefixed aspirate⁽⁴⁾,—the conjunctions **ḡṣ** “when”; **ḡṣ** “if”⁽⁵⁾; and a form shortened from the last, **ḡṣ** *āṇ*, in the apodosis of a Conditional sentence (§ 170); and with a prefixed demonstrative **ḡ**, in accordance with § 34, **ḡḡṣ** (for **ḡṣ** “that which”), “while”,

&c. אִישׁ, אֵין, אֵי; אִחַ, אִיל; אִיד, אִין, אִי. (2) מִנוּ; מִח; מִן. (1)

(³) אִיפָּה. (⁴) Somewhat the same as in אֲשֶׁר.

(^b) **DN**; on its derivation *cf.* EWALD, p. 225, Rem. 1.

“because”, “for”. From the Interrogative root *kwa* (§ 63, c) an impersonal Relative stem has originated, through simplification into *ka*, in the sense “that” (properly:—“what”)⁽¹⁾: It occurs in the compounds **እስከ**⁽²⁾ “until”, “as far as”; **እንከ** “therefore”, “*itaque*” (properly: “see that”, “seeing that”, “from that circumstance”). But this stem is mainly employed in processes of *Comparison*, with the meaning “as”, “like”⁽³⁾, first in **ከመ** “nearly” (“like what”)⁽⁴⁾; **ከመ** (*Prep.* and *Conj.*) “like”, “just as”⁽⁵⁾; farther,—when compounded with Demonstratives,—in **ከ** “therefore”, “now” (probably shortened from **ከ፤**—**ከ፤ከ፤**)⁽⁶⁾, and in **ከ** “thus” (from *kāhū*, “like it”), no longer in use alone, it is true (like **ከ፤**, **ከ፤**; **ከ፤**), but probably preserved still in **አከ** “in nowise”, “not”⁽⁷⁾. **ፍ**⁽⁸⁾ seems to have arisen, by sound-transition, out of **ከ** in the interrogative **አፍ** “how?”. The same *kō*, subdued into *kū*, seems to me to be involved also in **እስከ** (§ 62) which is made use of in appeals (for **ስከ**, § 34) “*τοίνυν*”, “*quaeso*”, “pray do!” (properly:—“since indeed”). The letter *k* might, however, be farther softened into *g*, and thus we can explain **እንጋ** “well now!” as being another form of **እንከ** (properly:—“see what!”),—perhaps also **ጊዜ** “moment”, “hour”, “time”, if this is at all of pronominal origin (for **ከ** + **ጊዜ**), and perhaps the quite obscure **የጊ** “perhaps”, “that . . . not”, “lest”. For the remains of another Relative *ia*, v. § 65.

Personal
Pronouns.

§ 65. (4) The purely Personal Pronouns of the three Persons, “I, Thou, He”—are, as the strongest Pronouns in the Ethiopic tongue, thoroughly compounded. The special root for the *Third Person* is of a purely vowel-character, viz. *u* or *i*, but not *a*. Although, at one time, even *a* possessed demonstrative force, as is still clearly shown in Sanskrit, it yet looked to that which was more remote, while on the other hand *u* or *i* looked to that which was nearer and more intimate⁽⁹⁾. In Ethiopic at least, *u* or *i* was employed whenever a demonstrative root had to be developed into a form with a personal reference (*cf.* **ቱ**, **ቲ**, **ከ**, **ኩ**). Even to

(1) *Cf.* Hebr. **כִּי**, EWALD, p. 230.

(2) **እስ** = **ገ፤**, by § 30.

(3) V. EWALD, § 105, b.

(4) *Cf.* **ሕገገገ**.

(5) **ከ፤**; **ሕገገገ**.

(6) *Cf.* also **ጋ**.

(7) So that **አ**, perhaps shortened from **አን** (§ 62) or **አል**, is possessed of negative force of and by itself. *Cf.* TRUMPP, p. 559, N. 1.

(8) EWALD, p. 232.

(9) EWALD, § 103, a.

denote any person other than *I* or *Thou*, *u* or *i* was at one time quite sufficient; and so, with the help of a final ě, the Ethiopic *u*^e, *i*^e emerged, i. e. **ወኡ** and **ይኡ** (§ 40)⁽¹⁾. Both of these stems **ወኡ** and **ይኡ**, however, were judged by the Ethiopians to be too weak, and they were accordingly strengthened by the annexation of the demonstrative root **ቱ** or **ቲ**⁽²⁾. When farther the distinction between *u* and *i* had become established in the language, so that *u* stood for the Masculine, and *i* for the Feminine⁽³⁾, there emerged the Pronouns **ወኡቱ** “he” and **ይኡቲ** “she”⁽⁴⁾. Both are substantives originally, but in the course of time they have come to be employed also as adjectives, like **እነ** &c., and are thereby brought down to the position of mere personal demonstratives. **ይኡ** was even made use of to form an adverb in **ይኡዚ** “at present”. The *Second Person* **ከንተ** is a compound of the root *tu* or *twa* for “thou”, and the demonstrative *an*⁽⁵⁾; but in certain types *ta*, which is a curtailed form of *twa*, is exchanged for **ከ** (§ 29), as in all Semitic languages. The *First Person* is certainly very much curtailed in Ethiopic, and takes the form **ኣኣ**; but both the plural **ንኣኣ**, and the **ከ** which still appears as the verbal termination for the first pers., show that *ana* has been shortened from *anōku* or *anōki*,—still preserved in Hebrew,—a compound of the demonstrative *an* and *ōki* = “I”.

Finally from the *ku*, *ka* or *ki*, which appears in the 1st and 2nd Persons, and occurs also as a more general Demonstrative in

(1) In the same way as **ከ** *zé*, “this”.

(2) This root is the basis of **እነ**; **ወኡ**; **ይኡ**; and, in Ethiopic itself, of **ሁ**, **ሃ** **ሆሙ**, and **ሆን**.

(3) [Cf. BARTH, ZDMG XLVI, p. 685 sq.]

(4) Seeing that **ቱ** and **ቲ** are still preserved complete everywhere else in Ethiopic, I cannot accept the explanation that **ወኡ** and **ይኡ**, *u*^e and *i*^e are weakened forms of *hu*^e and *hi*^e, and these again of *tu*^e and *ti*^e. That there were original pronouns *u* and *i* is clearly enough discernible still from the declension of **እኔ** and **እና** and the Latin *is*, from Zend and Lettish, as well as from the Guna forms **एन**, **एष** *avṛós*, and also from the Relatives **य** and **व** derived from these demonstratives (e. g. in **वत्**, **एव** &c.). In Semitic also there is a Relative *ia*, derived from that *i*, of which a trace is still preserved in Ethiopic in the Binding-vowel of the Construct State, and in the Adjective-ending *ī*; and it is not clear why this *ia* must be only a shortened form of *tia*.

(5) EWALD, p. 234.

accordance with § 62, *d*, an Abstract *kiyāt* came into being, shortened into **הָיָה** “*Selbstheit*”, which with the help of appended suffixes serves to express the notion of “self” (v. § 150)⁽¹⁾, and corresponds to the Arabic **أَنَا** and the Hebrew **אֲנִי**⁽²⁾. For another word

to signify the notion of “even he”, or “he himself” v. § 62⁽³⁾.

Conception-
al Roots.—
General
Description.

§ 66. 3. The third and highest stage of roots is formed by the *Conceptional Roots* (i. e. Roots conveying an *idea*, *conception* or *notion*—‘*Begriffswurzeln*’). They are the designations expressed in sounds of all the *simple ideas* which have been gathered by the mind of a people from the experience lying within the circle of their contemplation, and which have been developed by their mental activity. They are exceedingly manifold and numerous, but still they are capable of survey, and are not inexhaustible. Inasmuch, however, as no simple idea or notion is ever entertained, in actual thinking or in actual resulting speech, in a pure form, but each in a certain relation of thought,—there are no pure Conceptional Roots in actual speech, but only words which have been formed out of these roots. The root, which constitutes the hidden foundation of a number—which may be large—of words derived from it, is obtained from the actually existing words, only by the scientific process of Abstraction. The tracing back of words to roots in this way results in the announcement,—as the *first* fundamental law common to the whole family of the Semitic languages,—that *the majority of the vowels, and particularly all the short vowels, belong invariably to the formation and not to the root, and that the root thus consists of firmer letters only*. With this announcement is associated another,—as a *second* law quite as universally binding,—that *every Conceptional Root comprises at least three firm letters*⁽⁴⁾.

(1) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 549, N. 1 (contrary to PRAETORIUS, ZDMG XXVII, p. 640).

(2) EWALD, § 105, *sq*; NÖLDEKE, ‘*Mand. Gramm.*’, p. 390, N. 2; ‘*Syr. Gramm.*’ English ed., p. 226, N. 1; LAGARDE, ‘*Mitteilungen*’, I, p. 226; HAUPT, ‘*Beitr. z. Ass.*’, I, p. 20.

(3) On the Semitic Pronouns in general cf. O. VOGEL, ‘*Die Bildung des persönlichen Fürworts im Semitischen*’, 1866; CH. ENEBERG, ‘*De pronomibus Arabicis dissertatio etymologica*’, Helsingforsiae, I, 1872, II, 1874; and H. ALMKVIST, ‘*Den semitiska språkstammens pronomen*’, Upsala, 1875.

(4) On Biliteral nouns v. D. H. MÜLLER, ‘*Actes du VI^{me} Cong. d. Orient.*’, II, 1, p. 415 *sqq.*; and on the other side, BARTH, ZDMG XLI, p. 608 *sqq.*

No root has fewer letters than three, but a root may have more than three. There are Quadriliteral and Multiliteral Roots, but these are recognised without difficulty as later formations, which have been derived from simpler roots. Even within the sphere of these Multiliterals the law of Triliterality has had the effect of reducing many of them again to the form of Triliterals. And it may be remarked generally, that it is in the oldest Semitic languages that the law of Triliterality has exercised the most absolute sway, while in those languages in which the root-forming tendency continued in activity for a longer time,—and Ethiopic is one of them,—roots were more and more elaborated into Quadriliterals, whereas roots with more than four letters are not at all common. Accordingly even in Ethiopic the root usually consists of *three constant letters (Radicals)*. Consonants or long vowels rank as firm or constant letters, but, for a special reason to be explained farther on (§ 67 sq.), the vowels *i* and *u* are the only ones which occur as Radicals. The majority of roots are purely consonantal. Those roots only, which have a vowel as their second letter, like *mūt*, are capable of easy pronunciation. Scarcely any of the rest could be pronounced, for want of the necessary vowels. The usual practice therefore is to exhibit the root under the guise of one of the simplest existing word-forms possessed by the language, viz.—the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Perf. of the simple stem; and we shall adopt this practice throughout, writing *nagara*, for instance, instead of *ngr*, and so on⁽¹⁾.

Now according as a root consists of three (or more) Consonants, or on the other hand has in any position a long vowel instead of a consonant, there arise different kinds of roots; and inasmuch as the general rules for the formation of words from the root undergo special limitations and alterations according to the special kind of the root, the different possible kinds of roots must now be settled and described. The kind and order of the consonants, of which roots are composed, are in general completely free and unrestrained; for, as Semitic languages are generally rich in vowels, and the majority of words have at least two vowels, there may be found

(1) LUDOLF has frequently exhibited roots *mediae vocalis* in the guise of the Infinitive, like *ḥḥṭ*; but there is no satisfactory reason for adopting that method in Ethiopic. In this case also we shall write *ḥḥṭ*.

in a root, without detriment to the forms derivable from it, consonants standing together, which could not be pronounced together as one phonetic group without great difficulty. But yet even here the formative history of roots to some extent, and to some extent regard to convenience of pronunciation and to euphony, have imposed certain limitations upon the general freedom. We are speaking here only of roots made up of three radicals, as Multiliterals follow special rules of their own. The appearance of one and the same consonant twice in the root is allowable, and even common, in the position of second and third radicals. Cases in which the first and second radicals are identical, are, it is true, of more frequent occurrence in Ethiopic than in other Semitic tongues, but all such roots are secondary formations and are recognisable as forms shortened from quadriliterals, v. § 71. Roots too, which have the first and third radicals alike, *e. g.* **ወረወ**, are few in number, and have received this appearance only by a process of transformation from other roots, as in **ነተነ** and **ነጠነ**, from *natala*; **ሰከሰ**, from *sakata*; **ተሐተ**, from *tūh*; **ለዐለ**, from *‘al*; **ገለገ**, from *gal*, &c.; and, in particular, those roots *med. voc.* which have also the same consonant in the first and third places⁽¹⁾, are mostly replaced in Ethiopic by other roots, and are now represented only by a few Nominal stems, like **ኮኮ** and **ፃፂ**. Farther there is no admission within the root for two different Aspirates (with the exception of the softest one, **ኣ**, which is allowed to accompany other aspirates within roots, and may even stand immediately before or after **ሐ** or **ኀ**, though not immediately before or after any other, *e. g.* **ሀድኣ**, **ሐሥኣ**, **ኣምኀ**, **ኣይሕኣ**, **ኣኀረ**, **ኣኀዘ** &c.), nor readily for two different Palatal-Gutturals (still we have **ጉሕቂ** and **ቃግስት**), Labial Mutes, or Dental-Lingual Mutes⁽²⁾. Different Sibilants, however, are admitted in the same root, and even side by side (*e. g.* **ሠፀረ**, **ሰዘረ**, **ሰዘየ**, **ገሠጸ**). Also **ለረ**, **ነለ**, **ጠከ**, **ጸከ**, **ከጸ**, **ከጠ**, **ተቀ**⁽³⁾ are considered difficult of pronunciation, and therefore are for the most part avoided as combinations. Alongside of **ቀ**, **ዐ** is

(¹) A still more common occurrence in other Semitic languages, EWALD § 118, *a*.

(²) In **ኀዳጥ**, **ደ** is no more than a softer form of **ጠ**; **ድንተት** is a formation from **ደነነ**; **ተቅዳ** seems to be foreign (ጥገጥ); on **ደብተራ** v. § 73.

(³) On this depend *e. g.* **መጠቀ**, **ሰጠቀ**, **ጠቅዐ**, **ጠቀበ**.

placed in preference to **h** (**ḥ** and **ḥ**), and **z** in preference to **h** or **w**⁽¹⁾. **t** or **m** is in rare cases met with before **h** (e. g. **tho** and **māf**). Many of the transpositions of letters described above (§§ 24—32) may be traced back to these and similar rules.

§ 67. 1. *Tri-radical Roots which are composed of three Consonants*, are those which best answer to the Semitic root-forming tendency. Many of them may have existed in their tri-consonantal form in primeval times, even before the days when the Semitic linguistic family separated itself from a primeval language; but the most of them have assuredly arisen, by a re-casting process, out of longer or shorter original-roots, and by the hardening of such radical elements as originally had a vowel-character. Alongside of these, however, appear a large number of other roots, which have not yet attained this perfect root-form, or have degenerated from a perfect condition to a less perfect one: These constitute the *Imperfect and Weak Roots*.

Tri-radical
Roots:—
Strong
Roots.

Weak
Roots.

(a) A whole series exists of roots possessing only two Consonants, which are to be conceived as originally associated about a short vowel, (say *ā*, the one which comes readiest to hand), like *nab*. In order to bring these roots up to the proportion set by the fundamental Semitic law (§ 66), the language has either repeated both of them, and thus elaborated them into Quadrilaterals, like *gāsgasa* (cf. § 71), or it has only doubled the second letter, and developed them into Trilaterals, like *nababa*. With EWALD we then call them *Double-lettered Roots* (more exactly:—*Roots with the second letter doubled*), Lat.—*radices mediae geminatae*⁽²⁾.

Roots
med. gem.

Many of these roots are common to Ethiopic and the other Semitic languages. Others of them are peculiar to it,—the short original roots on which they are founded having been developed into Trilaterals by the other languages in a different way, e. g. **ḥḥ**, **ḥḥ**, **ḥḥ**. A few of these roots in Ethiopic are only recent formations, of a denominative character, like **ḥḥ**, **ḥḥ**.

(1) Hence **ḥḥ**, **ḥḥ** (**ḥḥ**), though, to be sure, we have **ḥḥ**.

(2) According to A. MÜLLER, ZDMG XXXIII, p. 698 sqq. (cf. NÖLDEKE, *ibid.* XLVI, p. 776) both these roots and roots *mediae w* had originally two radicals, and in the course of their inflection the Consonant became strengthened in the case of the former class, and the Vowel in the case of the latter.

These roots maintain their amplified trilateral form throughout the whole formation, and they follow absolutely the course taken by forms from strong roots, and at no point abandon the double letter, although, according to § 56, there may be cases in which the doubling is inaudible in pronunciation. Only, one trace of their origin is still shown in the fact that, when the first of the repeated letters is separated from the second merely by a fugitive *ě*, the *ě* is readily given up by these roots, and the letters approach each other, without however ceasing on that account to be uttered as a doubled sound,—as has been described in detail in § 55. In some rare cases the doubling is transferred from the second radical to the first, or it disappears entirely (v. § 56).

Roots
med. inf.

(b) We come upon a second kind of Imperfect roots in *Roots with a Vowel-centre*⁽¹⁾, (or *Vowel-centred Roots*), *i. e.* such as have for their second radical a long vowel,—more precisely a *ū* or an *ī* (*radices mediae infirmae*). Long *ā* does not occur as a second radical; for although originally there were roots with middle *ā*, they were bound, in the process of word-formation, to call in the help of some firmer letter, in fact an Aspirate, and they appear to have passed chiefly into roots with a middle Aspirate or with a middle *ī* or *ū*. On the other hand, roots with *ī* or *ū* as second radical abound. It is true that they also, like roots which have the second letter doubled, may be developed into the form of strong roots, by hardening their middle vowel into a Semivowel, but yet this is not always done, where it might have been expected in obedience to other formative and phonetic rules: fidelity to their origin is shown by their preservation of the vowel-pronunciation of the middle letter, wherever that is possible, as has been already described in § 50. Of these roots there are nearly as many with middle *ī* as with middle *ū*. Each of these vowels is tenaciously retained throughout the whole formation, in the root in which it has once been established; and almost no instance can be observed of the *ū* passing into *ī*, or the *ī* into *ū*. Farther, it is but seldom that both forms, with *ī* and with *ū*, have been brought into being to express the same meaning or a similar one (like **аѡѡ** and **аѡѡ**, **ѡѡ** and **ѡѡ**, **ѡѡ** and **ѡѡ**): frequently an entirely

(1) V. on the other hand KÖNIG, p. 108.

different meaning is attached to the form with *ū*, from that which belongs to the *ī*-form (e. g. **ሂጠ** and **ሃጠ**, **ከነ** and **ከከ**). Roots *med. voc.* are closely allied in origin with roots *med. gem.*, as is shown in particular by comparing the two kinds of roots in the various Semitic languages. It often happens that what one language has developed into a root *med. voc.* appears in another as a root *med. gem.*, and *vice versa*; cf. e. g. **ከደ** = **كَدَّ**, **ኦሐ** = **صَعَ**. But within Ethiopic itself the two kinds are kept strictly separate from one another: they do not pass over to one another in the process of formation, as they do for instance in Hebrew. It is farther a comparatively rare thing, to find both kinds of roots formed to express the same idea or a similar idea, as in **ህከከ** and **ሀከ**.

§ 68. (c) The third kind of weak roots may be called *Vowel-sided roots*, being such as have a vowel for their first or third radical (*radices primae* **ወ** et **የ**, and *radices tertiæ infirmæ*). They fall naturally into two subordinate classes:

(α) *Roots beginning with a Vowel*. There are no roots with *a* for their first sound. Seeing that no word can begin with a vowel, such roots would have to introduce the *a* by means of a Breathing (§ 34); and we may conceive that (as in the similar case, § 67, *b*) many roots, originally beginning with *a*, were consolidated into roots having an Aspirate for the first radical. Roots, on the other hand, which begin with *i* or *u* (although they too are bound,—whenever a word, formed from them starts clear with the first radical,—to harden that radical into the corresponding semivowel) reproduce the vowel readily as first radical when a prefix is applied, and thereby prove their origin (v. § 49). According to the analogy of roots *med. inf.* and *tert. inf.*, it might have been expected that about as many roots would begin with *u* as with *i*, but the fact is otherwise. If Northern-Semitic transformed almost all roots which begin with *u* into such as begin with *i*, Ethiopic, on the contrary,—in this, resembling Arabic,—has preserved the original *i* in a very few roots only, and then for quite special reasons. The root **የደዐ** “to know” retains *i* to distinguish it from **ወደኣ**, which is wholly different in meaning; in **የብሐ**, **የበበ**, **የውሀ** the transition from *i* to *u* was prevented by the phonetic character of the second radical (a Labial); while **የ-ጭ** and **የግን** are very old Semitic words. All other roots beginning with *i*, if such did

exist at first, have been replaced, partly by roots beginning with *u*, partly by vowel-centred and vowel-ending roots, and partly by still others. On the other hand, roots beginning with *u* have been formed in great abundance. The two classes of roots, moreover, have been kept separate throughout the entire formative process, without at any time passing into one another. But sometimes, though rarely, an exchange takes place between roots with initial *u* and those which have a middle *u*: thus we say **ሥረቀ** “spittle”, probably formed from **ሮቀ**, not from the ordinary **ወረቀ** ⁽¹⁾ (§ 116); and **ወሀበ** has in the Imperfect **ይሀብ** (§ 93): Conversely there appears **ወብሐ** “entrance”, from **ወብሐ** instead of **ቦሐ**, § 115. Comparison, however, with the other Semitic languages shows that they often have roots *med. inf.*, *tert. inf.* or *med. gem.*, corresponding to Ethiopic roots beginning with *u*, or else that these languages have still stronger letters in place of *u*, like *n* and *b*, *e. g.* **ወለጠ**, **بدل**; **ወቀዩ**, **بعلا**, **نجبا**, **يقر**; **ወግዐ**, **نجع**. Others appear to be recent formations of a denominative character, like **ወከረ**, from **ክን**; and **ወረረ**, from **ኸ**.

Vowel-
ending
Roots.

(β) *Roots ending in a Vowel.* Those roots, which originally perhaps had *a* for last radical, have in most cases hardened it into an Aspirate. Roots, on the other hand, which end originally in *i* and *u*, although they have a very decided leaning to the stronger form of expression, *i. e.* to the hardening of their vowel into a semivowel,—a much more decided leaning to it, in fact, than have the corresponding roots in the kindred tongues—, permit often enough the vowel-form to re-appear in suitable cases; for details on this point v. § 51. Roots which end in *i* are, however, more common than those in *u*. With some few exceptions in Nominal formation, these roots remain strictly separate from one another. It is but seldom that radical forms of both kinds are evolved in the language, to express the same meaning, like **ረሰዩ** and **ረሰወ**, **ዘረወ** and **ዘረዩ**. In other cases, when both forms were developed out of an original root, the significations were more or less strongly differentiated, *e. g.* **ጸገወ** “to be gracious”, and **ጸገዩ** “to bloom”; **ጸለወ** “to listen”, and **ጸለዩ** “to pray” (properly: “to incline” the ear, body or knee); **ሐለወ** “to watch”, and **ሐለዩ** “to think” (*cf.* **ጿዳ**). Of all the kinds of weak roots this is the one in greatest favour

(1) [V., however, DILLMANN, ‘Lex.’, col. 898].

in Ethiopic. It appears very frequently for the Vowel-centred and Double-lettered (*med. infir.* & *med. gem.*) roots of the other tongues. In some rare instances it is interchangeable, in Ethiopic itself, with roots *med. gem.*, as in አረረ and አረዩ with somewhat different meanings. Certainly the predominant sense borne by the whole of this class of roots is a transitive one; and accordingly, when new roots are to be derived from short nominal stems, the class is of use to express the doing, exercising, owning, &c. of that which is signified by the Noun, *e. g.* ለበወ, from ልብ; ገጸወ from ገጽ; ጠበወ from ተብ.

§ 69. (*d*) More than one weak radical may be found in one and the same root. Such roots are styled *Doubly Weak*. The most numerous represented among them in Ethiopic are those which are at once 'Vowel-beginning' and 'Vowel-ending', and have only the central radical a Consonant. Such as begin with *u* and end with *i* are of no uncommon occurrence, *e. g.* ወደዩ, ወ-ዕዩ. Only one root is known as yet, having *u* both at the beginning and at the end, viz. ወረወ; and not a single one is known, beginning with *i* and at the same time ending with *i* or with *u*. In the process of formation each of these two weak letters follows its own peculiar mode. Roots which have both a Vowel-centre and a Vowel-ending are fewer in number. They may have the same sound in the second and third place, just like roots *med. gem.* (ሀዩዩ, ዐዩዩ, ጉዩዩ), or they may have different sounds there, like ሐደወ on the one hand, and ረወዩ, ደወዩ, ጠወዩ, ሰወዩ on the other; but invariably, in the formative process, the second sound—a Vowel—must be hardened into a Semivowel (§ 50), while the third is treated as in the vowel-ending roots. The remaining possible combinations,—namely, the case of both first and second radicals being of a vowel-character, as in ወወ-ዐ, የወ-ሀ, and the case of the first radical being of such vowel-character, while the second and third are identical consonants, as in የበበ, ወደደ, ወከከ—present no peculiar features to affect the formative process, seeing that they occur only in stems and derivative forms in which a vowel-pronunciation either cannot be developed at all, or only in conformity with rules which hold good even in other cases.

There are no other Weak roots. Roots which begin with ኀ are all treated throughout as strong roots. And for the rest, it is only the largely employed root ብህሉ which has anything peculiar

Doubly
Weak
Roots.

about it, its peculiarity being that in one of its forms it gives up the final **A**, § 58. But roots which have an Aspirate in the first, second or third place, pursue a course of their own in the formative process, so far as the rules stated in §§ 43—47 are put in force with them. And if such roots, containing Aspirates, belong at the same time to one or other of the classes of Weak Roots, very peculiar forms of course may sometimes arise.

**Certain
Strong Ethi-
opic Roots
compared
with corre-
sponding
but Weak
Roots in
kindred
Languages.**

§ 70. Even these various classes of Weak roots, still existing in the language, furnish manifold information as to the nature of the most ancient root-construction. But besides, roots which have been fashioned into strong roots in Ethiopic, when compared with corresponding roots in the kindred tongues, discover in multifarious ways the manner of their origin. This is best illustrated in the case of roots, which contain an Aspirate by § 67 *sq.*:—Roots with Aspirates are very often changed in the different Semitic languages into Vowel-beginning, Vowel-centred or Vowel-ending roots, as well as into Double-lettered roots. Thus, for instance, **ṢṬA** compares with

أبل and وبل; and in Ethiopic itself **ሀድኡ** and **ወድኡ** are connected. Of roots with Middle Aspirate there may, *e. g.*, be compared: — **ከሀለ**, **ከሀላ**, **ከሀላ**; **ጸሀቀ**, **شاح**; **ግዕዝ**, **جاز**; **ጸዕቀ**, **ضاق**; **ንሀብ**, **نوبا** (and *vice versâ*, *e. g.* **በዩጸ**, **بعض**); **ምዕር**, **معر**; **ምዕዘ**, **مزر**. Ethiopic roots, which have an Aspirate for their final radical, often correspond to Vowel-ending or Vowel-centred roots in the other tongues, such as — **ሐሥኡ**, **חשע**; **ከላ**, **نضا**; **ቁጥዑ**, **قاج**; **ፈግዑ**, **فاج**. For the converse relation compare *e. g.* **በቀወ**, **بقع**; **ሀከዩ**, **هكع**. The process of forming roots by placing **ኀ** before an original root exhibits little vigour in Ethiopic. Nearly all Ethiopic roots, which have initial **ኀ**, have been formed in the same way in the other tongues⁽¹⁾; but many which are formed with *n* in the kindred tongues exhibit a different form in Ethiopic (*cf. e. g.* **ቀዩመ**, **نقم**). Frequently Ethiopic has **መ** instead of it, *e. g.* in **መከሐ**, **نبح** and **كهي**; **መጠወ**, **نطا** III, **عطا** IV. Farther **ኀ**, as third radical in proper Ethiopic roots,

(¹) Contrary to PRAETORIUS, '*Beitr. z. Assyr.*', I. p. 36 sq., who would compare Ethiopic Roots beginning with **ወ**, with Roots *primae Nūn* of the kindred tongues (**ወጽሐ**=نضم; **አውሥኦ**=أَنْشَأَ, ለፃፃ; **ወፈረ**=نفر).

§ 71. 2. Along with the Triliterals a large number of *Multilateral Roots* have been formed, which, viewed in the light of historical grammar, are to be estimated very differently. According to their origin we distinguish three leading classes.

**Multilateral
Roots:**
(a) *Original*-
ing in
repetition
of Indi-
vidual
Rads., or of
the Whole
Root.

(α) A large number of those formations arose out of Biliteral roots as yet undeveloped, or out of weak Triliterals, by *repetition of the whole root* or of its two chief letters. By this device the inner movement or repetition of the conception itself was expressed

in a highly picturesque fashion; and so this root-form appears with special frequency for those notions which involve ‘movement, mingling, custom, repetition, separation, gradual formation, or steadfast continuance, doubleness, multiplicity, or superfluity of parts or of acts’. Accordingly it is used in conveying the ideas of ‘tottering and wavering, trembling and rolling, going backwards and forwards’ (ሳሕሰሐ, ቀልቀለ, ናሕንሐ, ነክነክ, ተንተነ, ወልወለ, ፀንፀነ, ለጽለጸ, ኩርኩረ, ቈልቈለ, ገርገረ, ሰውሰው); of the ‘trembling, glittering movement of light’ (ለውለው, በስበሰ, ዋኅውኅ Hen. 108, 13, 14); of the ‘murmuring sound caused by repeated notes’ (ባሕብሐ, ጐርጐረ, —cf. also ፅንፅያ, § 58); of ‘dropping, welling forth, gushing, sprinkling’ (ነፍነፈ, ጠልጠለ, ፈልፈለ, ሳዕስዐ, ነሥነሠ); of ‘knocking, whipping, striking’ (ጐድጐድ, ጠብጠቦ, ጸንጸለ); of ‘stroking, shaving’ (መዝመዘ, ገስገስ); of ‘severing, emptying, crushing, dispersing’ (ለይለየ, በርበረ, ቀጥቀጠ, ቀጽቀጸ, ፈርፈረ, ዘርዘረ); of ‘growth’, of ‘superfluity’, of ‘nourishing’, and—*vice versâ*,—of ‘wasting away’, of ‘putrefying’ (ለምለመ, ፈድፈደ, ዛንዝኑ, ሰይሰየ, ደግደገ, ቁንቁነ, ባኑባኑ); of ‘checking, holding back’ (ጋህጋህ, ከልከለ alongside of ከልክ, ቀይቀየ); of ‘making ready’ (ጣእጥክ): also for ‘conditions and habits of soul and body’ (like ገይገየ “to sin”, ራህርህ “to be tender, soft”). Besides those which are enumerated here, there is a farther series of doubled roots retained only in Nominal stems, which are dealt with in § 112. Similar doubled roots in Arabic also correspond to a very considerable number of these roots. In the rest of the Semitic languages there are weak roots which answer to others of them, *e. g.* መዝመዘ, مَثَّ and مَشَّ; ራህርህ, رِي; ነፍነፈ, نَفَن; ጸፍጸፈ, ضَفَضَ; ገይገየ, غَوَى &c.

Meanwhile many an original doubled root in Ethiopic has been restored to the standard of triliterality by shortening; and thus have arisen several triliteral roots, formed in quite a peculiar way. In particular, by assimilating the second radical of a doubled root to the third a number of Tri-radical roots have been produced, of which the first and second letters are identical: the second, however, is invariably doubled, so that these roots in outward appearance resemble an Intensive stem. These are: ሠሥዐ (from ሠዕሥዐ, ሠሠ and ሠሠ) “to be insatiable”; ሰሰለ (ነጸ, ሰ) “to withdraw”; ቀቀየ “to be avaricious” (side-form of ቀይቀየ); መምዐ “to be timid”; ደደቀ “*accidit*” (from ወደቀ “to fall”); ወውዐ “to

raise a shout" (وَعَوَّعَ, وَعَى); **ገገጸ** "to be in anxiety"; **ገጉኑክ** "to hasten", "to be eager" (جَاجَأَ, جَاجَأَ). On the same process of Root-formation depend also Nominal stems, like **ከኩኑክ**, **ሰሰን**, **ደደክ** and others. More rarely, original doubled roots were shortened into Triliterals by transposing and contracting individual letters (as in **ለዐለ** = **ለዕዐለ** = **ዐልዐለ**; **ገለገ** = **ገልለገ** = **ገልገለ**), or by discarding the last letter (as in **ከለከ** = **ከልከለ**; **ለውል** = **لَوَّلُو**).

(β) Many Multiliteral Roots have been developed from Triradical roots already fully formed; by *repetition of the last radical or of the last two radicals*. Both modes of formation are employed also in the derivation of Intensive stems from still existing Triliterals (*cf. infra*, § 77). In this place we have to discuss those roots only, which do not occur in any other form than as Multiliterals. By reduplication of the last two letters, there have been formed **ደለቅለቅ** "to be shaken" (probably denominative); **ክጽደልደል** "to gleam"; and **ዐውዩወ** "to utter lamentations", an abbreviated form of **ዐወደወዩ** (عَوَّى)⁽¹⁾. More numerous than these Quinqueliterals are those Quadriliteral roots, which have been formed from Triliterals by repeating the last radical; and, just like the stronger reduplication of the entire root, this weaker repetition of merely the last radical is employed chiefly to express those ideas which involve the gradual progressiveness or the duration, continuation or constancy of the individual acts, or the vehemence and thoroughness of the action, or ideas which convey some inherent disposition. To this class belong **ከውለለ** "to become giddy" (ከለ); **ጠብለለ** "to roll up" (ጠቅ); **ሰውጠጠ** "to fall into perplexity or terror" (ساط, *cf. ሠጠዩ*); **ባሕረረ** "to be terrified" (بَحِرَ or بَحِرَ); **ሐንቀቀ** "to be in anxiety" (ገንቅ, ገንቅ); **ሳሕበበ** "to be mouldy" (شهب, شيب, ሰዩበ); **ፈርዘዘ** "to burst" (of a bud); **ፈርገገ** "to heal" (of a wound, — properly "to break up" فرج); **ጠውለለ** "to be flabby", "to hang loose"; **ዛህለለ** "to play tricks"; **ሐብቀቀ** "to bedaub one's self"; **ማህለለ** "to deal mildly, or graciously with any one" (مهل); **ባህነነ** "to withdraw", "to escape"; **ደምሰሰ** "to abolish", "to destroy"

(¹) But this root in the end goes back to **ወደ** "woe!" (§ 61); and **ዐ**, from **ከ**, is Causative: [indeed **ከውዩወ** still occurs:—*Kebra Nag.* 54 a 18; 67 b 23; 131 a 16 sq.]

(دَمَسَ); **ṢCḶḶ** “obstinate”, from the $\sqrt{\text{ṢCḶḶ}}$; and, besides, the roots of various Nominal stems, v. § 112. Specially remarkable are the roots **ḶḶḶḶ** “to whisper softly” (**ḶḶḶḶ**, **ṢḶḶ**), and **ḶḶḶḶ** “to be somewhat serious” (from **ḶḶḶḶ**), because they have continued to keep the long vowel of the noun, from which they sprung.

M. R.: (b)
Originating
in Inter-
polation of
Firm Letter
after 1st Rad.

§ 72. (b) While, however, the whole of this first class of Multiliteral Roots is due to an original and general formative tendency in Semitic languages, and while the only thing peculiar in this matter to Ethiopic perhaps consists in its scarcely ever retaining, or its never having developed, the trilateral forms alongside of such longer forms,—the occurrence or the predominance of the second class is, on the other hand, a mark of decline in the formative powers of the language. In this second class we rank those Multiliteral Roots, which have arisen from the *interpolation of one of the former letters after the first radical*. The interpolation of the mixed vowel \bar{e} or \bar{o} is less remarkable, as it may be considered a variety of the formation of the third Verbal Stem (§ 78). It occurs very seldom indeed in Ethiopic⁽¹⁾. Farther it very seldom happens that an Aspirate is inserted after the first radical, as it is in (**Ḷ**)**ḶḶḶḶ** “to overlook”, “to forget” (**ḶḶḶḶ**, **ḶḶḶḶ**). A Liquid is very frequently interpolated, partly to give the root greater fulness of sound (§ 58), partly to make up for that doubling of the second radical which is called for by the formation (§ 56, *in fin.*). So far, the most of these forms might be dealt with at a later stage, in discussing word-formation; but, to facilitate a general survey, it seems better to set them together here. Generally it is the *Nasal ʔ*, which amplifies a Trilateral root into a Quadriliteral. This **ʔ** occurs most frequently before Labials⁽²⁾:—**ḶḶḶḶ**, **ḶḶḶḶ**; **ḶḶḶḶ**, **ḶḶḶḶ**; **ḶḶḶḶ** “lion” (**ḶḶḶḶ**, from **ḶḶḶḶ**); **ḶḶḶḶ** “brick” (**ḶḶḶḶ**); **ḶḶḶḶ**, **ḶḶḶḶ**; **ḶḶḶḶ** “camel’s saddle”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “navel”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “scab” (§ 57); **ḶḶḶḶ** “crisping-pin” (**ḶḶḶḶ**); **ḶḶḶḶ** “lip”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “berry”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “to scratch”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “to turn upside down”; often too before Palatal-Guttural Mutes:—**ḶḶḶḶ** “eye-brows”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “virgin”; **ḶḶḶḶ** “to be lame”; **ḶḶḶḶ**

(1) Oftener in Syriac: HOFFMANN, ‘Syr. Gramm.’, p. 186.

(2) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 99.

“to be exact”; **ዘንግዐ** “to talk at random”; **ዘንጉጉ** “to mock”; **ደንቀወ** “to be deaf, or hard of hearing” (ደንቀ); **ፀንግዐ** “to lie on the side” (whence **ምፀንጋፅ** along with **ምፅጋፅ**): rather less frequently before Aspirates and Sibilants, and before **ተ** and **ጠ**: **ጽንሐሕ** “whole burnt-offering” (صَح, ب); **ሰንክለ**, from **ሰክለ**; **ቄንዛክ** “ringlet” (قَزَع); **መዐንሰብ** “soothsayer” (بش); **ፈንጸጸ** ‘a disease’; **መንዘዘ** “to revile” (مَط, مَط); **ኅንጸጸ** “to pick out grains”; **ቅንጣዌ** “gnawing hunger” (بم); **ቀንጠበ** “to pierce” (بم); and probably in **አንተለ** “to be impatient”. This nasal has in one instance passed into **መ** before **ጠ**⁽¹⁾: **ሰምጥዐ** “to put the field in good order”; and in **ጽርንዕት** “scab” (تقرح) it has slipped in after the Liquid *r*. *R* is found instead of *n*, but only in a few words⁽²⁾:—**መርሰሰ** “to feel for, to grope” (شس); **ሐርበደ** “to wallow in the mire” (حَرَمَد); **ፈርዐጸ** “to leap” (فَرَش, شَرَش); **ሐርገጽ** “crocodile”. Several of the words and roots enumerated here exhibit also a like form in Syriac or in Arabic⁽³⁾.

§ 73. (c) The last class of Multiliteral Roots,—an exceedingly numerous one,—is *derived from Triliteral Roots and Words by the external application, before or after them, of formative letters*, and in fact in manifold fashion. Several have been formed at first merely as *derived Verbal Stems* from the tri-radical root; but in process of time and on various grounds they ceased to be recognised as derivatives and came to be treated in the language as independent roots. A prefix **ሰ**,—more fully **አሰ**, which at one time was employed in the formation of Causative stems (§ 79),—may still be clearly recognised both in certain triliteral roots (§ 70 *ad fin.*), and in certain multiliterals;—partly in Nominal stems, like **ሰረገላ** “cart” (سَلَج, سَلَج) [?]; **ሰንቡክ** “lungs” (سِنْب); **ሰፌልያ** “hammer” (سَف); **መስከረም** ‘name of a month’ (“beginning of winter or of the year”);—partly in Verbal Roots, such as **ሰርገወ** “to adorn” (*cf.* certain roots in the other Semitic tongues, which begin with *rag* and *raq*); **ሰንቀወ** “to play the harp”, and several others, v. § 85 *ad fin.* In **ጸምላጥ** “blear-eyed”, and **ጸብረቀ** “to diffuse

M. R.: (c)
Derived
from Trili-
teral Roots
and Words,
by External
Application
of Forma-
tive Letter.

(1) V. also HOFFMANN, ‘Syr. Gr.’ p. 186.

(2) Cf. EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 191; HOFFMANN, cited *supra*.

(3) The origin of the roots **ዐንበዘ**, **ዐንዘረ**, **ዕንቀራ**, **ኅንፈጸ** is still obscure or doubtful; yet v. next Note.

light", "to scintillate", the **h** has even been thickened into the sound of **g** ⁽¹⁾. An original **t**, serving to form Reflexives, has been softened into **l**, thus becoming unrecognisable, in **ḡḡ-ḡḡ** "locusts" (ḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡḡ** "rag" (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡḡ** "purple" (ḡḡḡḡ, ḡḡḡḡ) [from Assy. *argamannu*]; and **ḡḡḡḡ** "to become an orphan", "to be bereaved" (ḡḡḡḡ, ḡḡḡḡ). By means of the reflexive prefix **ḡḡ** (§ 87) there have been formed the root **ḡḡḡḡ** "to act as intercessor for any one" (from **ḡḡḡḡ**), and the word **ḡḡḡḡḡḡ** "bridge" ('covering over of the river', ḡḡḡḡ).

A series of Multiliteral Roots of another sort came to be formed from trilateral roots, or rather words, by means of an appended *ē*, *ō*, *i* or *u*, through which also Tri-radical roots ending in a vowel are derived from Nominal stems (§ 68, *ad fin.*). This formative vowel-suffix, when it was a new-comer, and not a fundamental part of the Nominal stem, must originally have had the power of forming Transitives and Causatives. It is therefore of service in the derivation of new roots which have the sense of 'doing or exercising' what is expressed in the ground-root or ground-word. This formation has become a very favourite one in Ethiopic (even in a greater degree than in Syriac) ⁽²⁾. To this class belong:—**ḡḡḡḡ** "to acquire by trickery" (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** "to calumniate" (ḡḡḡḡ and ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** "to shoot"; **ḡḡḡḡ** "to stab in the throat", "to slaughter"; **ḡḡḡḡ** "to delay" (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** "to wither", "to dry up"; **ḡḡḡḡ** "to become brutalised" (but also **ḡḡḡḡ**); **ḡḡḡḡ**, from **ḡḡḡḡḡḡ**, and **ḡḡḡḡ** "to clear of weeds"; perhaps also **ḡḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡḡ**. Still more common are those roots which have been formed with **ḡ**:—**ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (§ 72); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ). In many cases the form *aya* or *awa* is

⁽¹⁾ Similarly an **h** of the Causative Stem may have been hardened into **o** (v. § 70) in **ḡḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡḡ**, if these actually belong, as I imagine they do, to **ḡḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡḡ** (ḡḡḡḡ); and into **ḡ** in **ḡḡḡḡ**, if this may be compared with **ḡḡḡḡ**. The **t** in **ḡḡḡḡ** "to mix (fluids)" is probably causative also; v. HOFFMANN, p. 187; EWALD, 'Hebr. Spr.', § 122, a.

⁽²⁾ HOFFMANN, p. 186; and EWALD, 'Hebr. Spr.' § 125, b.

⁽³⁾ In the existence of several roots of this kind, PRAETORIUS, — 'Beitr.

already suggested by the termination of the fundamental word: *cf. e. g.* **ጉርዐየ**, from **ጉርዔ**; **ጓሕለወ**, from **ጉሕሉት**. More rarely an Aspirate (instead of *ē* or *ō*) serves the same purpose, as in **መርገህ** “to throw stones”, from **መርገ**; **አይሕአ**, from **አይሕ**; **ጠውልዐ** (ጠ, طال).

While we may see, in the series which has just been dealt with, the Ethiopic offshoots of an original Semitic formative-impulse, which once exercised a powerful influence even in the development of trilateral roots,—a *third series*, which is now to be described, *depends*, on the other hand, *upon an after-formation belonging to the later period of the language*. In the course of time it became usual in Ethiopic to derive,—from Nominal stems which had been fashioned by formative additions of a consonantal character,—new Verbal roots, which continued to retain these formative additions, and which thus had of necessity to be Multiliteral. This recent style of formation is relatively more common in Ethiopic than in Arabic⁽¹⁾. Such roots are most frequently formed from Nominal stems having **መ** prefixed, like **መዝበረ** “to lie in ruins”; **ማህረክ** “to make booty of”. Of some 30 of these forms⁽²⁾, the following, which have been fashioned from simpler roots beginning with a vowel, are specially to be remarked: **ማሰነ** “to decay”, from **أَسْنَنَ**, **ወሰነ**, **وَسَنَ**; **ዋቅሐ** “to take prisoner”, from **وَقَعَ**, **وَقَح**; **ዋጥሐ** “to veil”. More rarely, Consonantal formative suffixes of the Nominal stems are retained; in particular **ኒ**, in **(ክ)ሠልጠነ**, from **ሥልጣን** (*cf.* **تسلطن**); and perhaps in **ዴንን** “to persecute”; oftener **ተ**, as in **ሐብረተ** “to polish”; **(ተ)መትሐተ** “to appear as a phantom” (G. Ad.); **ጸልመተ**; **መጽወተ**; **ኮሰተ**; **ጋህረተ** and **(ክ)መስረተ** “to found” (from **መሰረት**, from the root **ሰረረ**, so that both **መ** and **ተ** are formative letters here). And sometimes this **ተ** appears even to have penetrated, from its position as a final letter, into the original

z. Ass. I, p. 31 *sqq.*,—is disposed to find a proof “that Ethiopic at one time, like Hebrew and Arabic in the case of roots *med. gem.*, knew of the attachment, by means of *ō* or *au*, of inflectional endings which begin with a consonant”.

(1) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 191.

(2) I have not enumerated all these forms in this place, seeing that for the most part they may easily be found in the dictionary under the letter **መ**.

root itself, as in **ሐርተመ** “to be ill off” (from **ሐረመ**, cf. **مَكْرَم**); **ገፍትአ** “to destroy utterly” (**كف**); perhaps also in **ከስተረ** ⁽¹⁾.

Through the same energy of the later formative processes, verbs were derived from foreign words, like **መንከሰ** from *μοναχός*; **መንገነ** from *μηχανή* [= *μάγγανον*]; **ፈልሰፈ** from *φιλόσοφος* &c.

Besides the various classes of Multiliteral roots which have been described hitherto, there are other individual roots, of obscure or rare formation, *e. g.* **ዘልገሰ**:—for those, in particular, which have been developed into Nominal stems, *v. infra*, § 112. The general result is, that Multiliteral roots are very fully represented indeed in Ethiopic.—They may be estimated approximately as amounting to a sixth or a seventh part of the entire number of roots in the language.

B. FORMATION OF WORDS.

§ 74. With the exception of Interjectional roots and certain Pronominal roots, which in their first and original form have acquired the value of small independent Words, all roots must pass through one or more stages of transformation, before they can be used as Words of actual speech. Following the various determined modes and conditions of thought, under which the mind of man can regard a conception, the root must also assume various forms, in order to become a suitable expression of the conception so regarded. The more general of these determined modes are the first to receive the stamp of language, and then the process is applied to those which are more special, and so on, until the very finest distinctions, of which a conception is capable, have expression given to them in speech. The formative expedients which are applied in this process in Semitic languages, and accordingly in Ethiopic, are of *three* sorts. 1. Comparatively small and originally independent particles, mostly of pronominal origin, approach the root or the stem in order to fix and determine the general conception contained in it, by means of their own signification; and

(¹) The two following forms are to be regarded as secondary abbreviations from Multiliteral roots:—**ነበላ** “flame”, from **አንበላበላ** (root **ነሐይ**, **ላህበ**); and **ንኩላ** “reeling”, from **አንኮላላ** (root **ኮለ**).

Methods
followed
generally in
Word-
Formation.
Division of
Words into:
—1. Verbs;
2. Nouns;
3. Particles.

in this proceeding the language displays a sustained endeavour to knit together these external additions as intimately as possible with the root or stem, and cause them to coalesce with it. In a few cases such additions, originally external, make their way into the interior even of the root or stem. 2. This expedient is confronted by another, which sets itself to develop the root from its own resources, by doubling one or more of its radicals. But this device, which became very important in the formation of roots (§§ 67, 71), is of comparatively limited application in the formation of words, and extends only to the stem-formation of Verbs and Nouns. And in the farther stages of formation it is not the radicals, but individual formative vowels, which in an analogous fashion are lengthened and broadened, to give expression to a new determination of the fundamental idea. 3. But the expedient most current in Semitic speech, and which is at the same time the most delicate and intellectual, is Vowel-change within the Root. Even the form of Semitic roots (§ 66) testifies to the commanding prevalence of this means of formation. All vowels, with the exception of those which naturally cling to certain weak roots, are mobile; and,—according to their kind, their shortness or their length, their number, position or relation to each other,—they serve the purposes of the formative process and determine the meaning.—The greater number of actual words, however, have been produced by the co-operation of two or even all the three of the means of formation which have just been described.

The most common and obvious distinction, differentiating root-ideas⁽¹⁾, is the contrast between the Verb and the Noun, or between the word which signifies action and the word which indicates a name. All the words of the language take a position either on the one side or on the other. Roots conveying general notions are for the most part developed into both verbs and nouns, Pronominal roots only into nouns. To nouns, taken in the widest sense, belong also by their origin many Particles and Prepositions, which however, by reason of their frequent use, are here and there much mutilated in form. But just because in Ethiopic the majority of Particles and Prepositions (being those of Pronominal origin)

(¹) [*i. e.*,—general notions or conceptions presented by those collocations of letters which we call *Roots*. TR.]

have not yet been formed into true Nouns, and exhibit peculiar formations and laws of formation, they must be treated of specially. We accordingly distinguish between 1. *Verbs*, 2. *Nouns*, 3. *Particles*.

FORMATION OF VERBS.

The stages of formation, which the Verb must pass through, are *three* in number; 1. Stem-formation; 2. Tense- and Mood-formation; 3. Formation of Persons, Genders and Numbers.

I. STEM-FORMATION OF VERBS.

General
Description
of
Verbal
Stems.

§ 75. The Root is fashioned into the Verb by means of one definite vowel-pronunciation, and into the Noun by means of another. For example, *tkl* is a Verb, when pronounced **†hA**, and a Noun, when pronounced **†hA**⁽¹⁾. The difference between Verbs and Nouns, which have proceeded directly from the root, accordingly consists at first in the vowel-pronunciation alone. A more exact account cannot be given until we come to describe the individual forms themselves, seeing that the vocalisation is different in different formations; yet it may be observed, in general terms, that the verb has shorter and more mobile vowels than the noun. But just as from one root, not merely a single noun but an abundance of them may issue, so too there issues from the same a series of verbs, each of which impresses upon the fundamental notion a new determination. Following the lead of others we call those verbs which have been derived mediately or immediately from the root, *Verbal Stems* (or *Conjugations*). In Ethiopic there are twelve of these; or, if one or two stems are taken into account which are employed only in the case of quadriliteral roots, there are thirteen or fourteen different stems, which may be formed from one root. Of these verbal stems, all those whose meaning did not render it *a priori* impossible, appeared, at one time, under the contrast of an Active and a Passive voice by means of internal vowel change; and to this there was added, in the first or simple stem, the distinction of a semi-passive or intransitive voice. But of this passive form, effected by internal vowel change, such as is exhibited in Hebrew, and in the most consistent fashion in Arabic, Ethiopic preserves no more

(1) On the question of priority relative to Noun and Verb, v. A. MÜLLER ZDMG XLV, p. 237 sq.

than a few traces (in the Participle); and it is only the semi-passive form in the first stem (and partly in the reflexive of the simple stem) that is still regularly distinguished in Ethiopic. The proper Passive form, however, is made up for by another device, the reflexive form, just as in Aramaic. On this ground we shall deal with the subject of the distinction between Active and Passive, in connection with the account to be given of Stem-formation. The Stem-formation itself assumes different fashions in Triliteral and Multiliteral roots, which must be dealt with separately.

1. STEM-FORMATION OF TRI-RADICAL ROOTS.

§ 76. Scheme of Stems and their Relations:

Scheme
of
Stems.

I.

II.

III.

IV.

Ground-Stems. Causative St. Reflexive St. Causative-Reflexive Stems.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------|---|---|
| 1. Simple St. | $\begin{Bmatrix} ነገረ \\ ገብረ \end{Bmatrix}$ | 1. አግባረ | 1. $\begin{Bmatrix} ተገብረ \\ ተዐቀበ \end{Bmatrix}$ | 1. $\begin{Bmatrix} አስተርከበ \\ አስተረሐቀ \end{Bmatrix}$ |
| 2. Intensive St. | ፈጸመ | 2. አፈጸመ | 2. ተፈጸመ | 2. አስተጸነሰ |
| 3. Influencing St. | በረከ | 3. አላቀሰ | 3. ተካፈለ | 3. አስተካፈለ ⁽¹⁾ . |

In conformity with this Scheme we shall continue to denote the several Stems by I, 1; II, 1; II, 2, &c.

I. Ground-Stems.

I. Ground-
Stems:—
1. The
Simple
Stem.

1. In the first or *Simple Stem*, which proceeds directly from the root, the Verb is distinguished from the Noun of corresponding

⁽¹⁾ [It is to be observed that PRAETORIUS, '*Aethiop. Gramm.*', p. 36 sqq., formulates a Scheme of Verbal Stems, which differs considerably from the one given here. He enumerates 5 original and independent Ground-Stems, instead of DILLMANN's 3, the 3rd and 5th being of a *Paial* and *Paual* type respectively, viz.—**ቁተለ** and **ቆተለ**. From the first of these two he easily derives the Imperfect form **ይቁትለ**, which is also used as the Indicative of the Intensive Stem,—rejecting as unsatisfactory D.'s account of the origin of this last Imperfect form. Forms, however, presenting the types **ቁተለ** and **ቆተለ**—which P. regards as illustrations or survivals of his 3rd and 5th Stems—D. considers as belonging properly to his own 3rd or Influencing Stem, while in their farther formation they follow the Multiliteral roots (*cf. infra*, § 78). At the same time, PRAETORIUS' analysis of Verbal formation,—which is accepted by several scholars,—deserves most careful consideration, even if it does not itself claim to be conclusive on every point. It may be doubted whether all the difficulties of this portion of Ethiopic Grammar are even yet finally settled. Meanwhile, DILLMANN's Scheme may be safely adopted as the *Norm* of the Regular Stems. TR.]

formation, by the circumstance that the leading vowel comes after the second radical. This vowel is *a*, when the verb is of active signification. In later times it took the tone, but hardly at first⁽¹⁾. The first letter of the root, properly being without a vowel, when it forms a syllable for itself, calls in the help of the readiest vowel, that is to say, the vowel *a* in this case too (§ 60), for its own utterance. Farther the last radical letter is always uttered with *a* in the 3rd pers. sing. Perf., just as in Arabic, even with all Roots *tertiæ infirmæ* (cf. *infra* § 91). Accordingly this stem in the active form is given as **ነገረ** *nagára*, “he has spoken”. Ethiopic, however, like the other Semitic tongues, makes a difference,—by means of a different vocalisation,—between the Transitive or Active verb of the first stem, and the Intransitive or Semi-Passive verb, which expresses participation, not in pure doing, but either in suffering or in a mere condition. In place of the *a* after the second radical in the Active verb, the Intransitive verb has *ě*⁽²⁾, as in **ነገረ** “he was active”; and this vowel finally disappeared altogether, so that it was pronounced *gábra* instead of *gaběra* (§ 37)⁽³⁾. Thus the Intransitive pronunciation of the strong verb coincides entirely, in outward form, with the Transitive of Verbs *tert. guttur.*, like **ከልከ**, according to § 92. This mode of distinguishing Intransitive verbs by means of the pronunciation has remained in full vigour in Ethiopic. All verbs which denote properties, bodily or mental states, emotions, confined activities, are pronounced with *ě*, like **ርሕበ** “to be wide”; **ዐብዩ** “to be great”; **ደክመ** “to be tired”; **ጸገበ** “to be satisfied”; **ጸድቀ** “to be just”; **ነግሠ** “to be a king”, “to rule”; **ርኅበ** “to hunger”; **ርእየ** “to see”; **ረወዮ** “to drink to satiety”; **ሐመ** “to suffer” (= **ሐምመ**); **ሐጉለ** “to perish”. It is the same too with those verbs which have a reflexive meaning, like **ለብሰ** “to clothe one’s self”, and in rare cases even with those which express free activity but

(1) Cf. Arabic, Amharic and Tigriña (SCHREIBER § 83). KÖNIG also correctly observes, p. 161, that the toning of the second syllable was not original. In later times, to be sure, *á* at least appears to have received the tone after the second radical; v. LUDOLF, ‘Gramm’. I, 7, and TRUMPF, p. 525, who however is himself obliged to allow, that, strictly taken, *nábàra*, *ágbàra*, *bá-ràka*, would have to be accentuated, seeing that “the voice lifts up the first syllable with a certain emphasis.”

(2) Instead of the *ũ* and *ĩ* (*ō*, *ē*) of the other languages, by §§ 17, 19.

(3) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 81.

associated with effort and toil, like **ለጉመ** “to rein in”; **ሰትረ** “to hew in pieces”; **በቀኝ** “to rake coals of fire together”. The greater number of them are not strictly intransitive, but are rather to be compared with the Greek Middle, seeing that they may have Objects. Many of them occur under both forms of expression like **መስለ** and **መሰለ** “to be like”; **ኀረየ** and **ኀረየ** “to be pleased”, and “to elect”; **ጉየ** and **ጉየየ** “to flee”; **ሰከበ** and **ሰከበ** “to lie” and “to lie down”⁽¹⁾.

Intransitive verbs of the Simple Stem may even stand directly for the Passive of their Causatives, at least where the operative cause is not given, *e. g.* **ወዕየ** *ἐνεπρήσθη* Josh. 6, 24; **ሞቱ** “they were put to death” Josh. 8, 25; **ኀጸረ** (in Transitive expression) “to become short”, also “to be shortened” Matt. 24, 22; **ገብአ** *ἀποκατεστράθη* Matt. 12, 13 [and **በርህ** “to become enlightened” *Kebra Nag.* 112 a 21].

§ 77. 2. *The Intensive Stem.* An intensifying of the idea of the verb, whether it be in indicating more or less frequent repetition, or to signify force, eagerness or completeness in the action, is expressed by repeating the radicals; and, according as one or another or several of them together are repeated, very different forms will be produced by this mode of formation. But although, according to § 71, a very large number of Multiliteral roots have sprung, by means of this formative expedient, from simple original roots now lost to the language, yet in the department of ordinary triliteral roots the majority of the possible repetitions of the root-letters have not been brought into common use. The formation which is relatively of most frequent occurrence is contrived by the repetition of the last two radicals. It expresses in a very picturesque manner the notion of ‘backwards and forwards’, ‘unremittingly’, ‘again and again’, in **(አ)ርመስመስ** (§ 57) “to feel as a blind man does” (*palpavit*), from **መርሰሰ** (**ሠሠ**, § 72); **(አ)ንጠብጠበ** “to drip” (from **ነጠበ**), and interchanging with it, **(አ)ንጸፍጸፈ** “to distil”; **(አ)ንበልበለ** “to blaze” (from **ነበለ**); **(አ)ስቆቆወ** “to howl” (*cf.* **ሰከየ**); **(አ)ርሳሕሰሐ** “to utter reproaches” (from **ረሰሐ**); **አኅሰርሰረ** “to revile repeatedly” (from **ኀሰረ**); and it serves besides

2. The
Intensive
Stem.

(1) It is the same with **ሠርጸ**, **ኀብረ**, **ሠምረ**, **ወድቀ**, **በቀኝ**, **ተርፈ**, **ከብረ**, **ዐርበ**, **ፀርፈ**, **ፈርየ**, **ምሕረ**, **ምሕከ**, **ሥሕቀ**, **ስሕጠ**, **ስእለ**, **ወሕጠ**, **ግዕረ**, **ሐጸ**, **ነድ**.

to express variation in the case of words denoting colour:—
 (አ)ቀያሕይሐ “to gleam red” (ቀይሐ); (አ)ጎመልመል “to become green” (ጎምል), cf. § 110. More rarely the repetition of the final radical occurs with a like meaning, as in § 71, β:—በርደደ “to hail” (በረድ “hail”); (አ)ማዕረረ “to sweeten” (መዓር “honey”); ገበሰሰ “to plaster with stucco” (γύψος); ገልበበ “to veil” (from ገለበ = ገለወ ‘to cover over’). In the formation all the stems which are mentioned here, just like those enumerated in § 71, are treated as Multiliterals.

In place of these more vigorous and violent reduplications, a finer and easier intensifying device has become usual in the language, namely, *the doubling (or strengthening) of the second radical*, effected too in such a way, that this letter is simply repeated without any intervening vowel⁽¹⁾, as in ነጸረ *náṣṣara* “to view, to consider” (cf. *infra*, § 95 *sqq.*, for a more precise statement regarding the vowel-expression in this and the following stems).

1. This Intensive Stem is a favourite mode of conveying those verbal notions that seek to express ‘dealings, practices and usages’ which consist in a series or group of individual acts, or which by their nature continue for some time, like ሐለወ “to watch”; ሐለዩ “to turn over in one’s mind”, “to meditate”; ዘመረ “to play” (on a musical instrument); ጎለቁ “to number”; ወደሰ and ሰብሐ “to praise”; ጸወዐ “to call upon”; ገሠጸ “to chastise”; ሐሰወ “to tell lies”; ዘመወ “to commit fornication”; አበሰ “to sin”; ዐመፀ “to act unjustly”;—as well as those in which ‘force, completeness, rapidity, effort, or promptitude’ is made prominent, like ጎዩለ “to exert strength”; ወረወ “to throw”; መረደ “to hasten”; ሠገረ “to take quick steps”; ጸዐረ “to feel pain”;

(¹) Doubling, effected in such a way that the constituents of the doubled letter are separated by a vowel, is found in this case, it is true, in Amharic, but not in Ethiopic; and wherever such stems occur, they are to be regarded as introduced from Amharic, e. g. ይትማየየጥ Gen. 3, 24, Note. According to TRUMPF, p. 522, when the second radical is doubled, the second syllable has always the tone, even when it contains ě: ረሰዩ *rassáya*; ሰብሐ *sabbéha*—(but ሀሎ: *halló*, because contracted from ሀለወ *halláwa*). On the other hand, in Amharic the first syllable has always the tone; and so the second radical is always doubled in the Perfect, even in Non-Intensive stems: v. GUMI, ‘Gramm. elem.’, p. 21, and ‘Sulla reduplicazione delle consonanti amariche’ in ‘Supplemento period. dell’ Archivio glottol. Ital.’ II, 1893, p. 1 *sqq.*; [and ‘Zeitschr. f. Assyr.’ VIII, p. 245 *sqq.*]

ተከዘ "to be much grieved"; **ሠፀረ** "to split"; **ደቀቀ** "to pound"; **ጠየቀ** "to consider closely"; **ፈከረ** "to explain" &c.

2. This stem serves directly to express active working and doing, associated with the accessory notion of carefulness and zeal. Accordingly it often comes into touch with the Causative stem, by its being also able to signify the making or doing of something, either in actual production or merely in word or thought, as for instance declaring or regarding a person or thing as being this or that: *cf.* **ሐደፈ** "to lead", "to guide"; **ከሥነ** "to judge"; **ፈጸመ** "to complete"; **መሀረ** "to teach"; **ሐደሰ** "to renew"; **ቀደሰ** "to sanctify" and "to declare holy"; **ከመረ** "to show" ("to make high, *or* clear"); **ወድከ** "to make an end"; **ለቅሐ** "to lend" ("to cause to be taken"); **ኣዘዘ** "to command" ("to exercise power"). And since in Ethiopic many notions are regarded as belonging to the category of Action, which we are wont to express in our own languages rather as properties or conditions, there emerges an explanation of the employment of the second stem in cases like **ሠነየ** "to be beautiful" ("to acquire form"); **ኣደመ** "to please" ("to content"); **ሐወዘ** "to be agreeable to" ("to delight"); **ሀለወ** "to be", "to become" ("to acquire being"), and many others.

3. Accordingly this stem is frequently employed in the formation of Denominatives⁽¹⁾, in the signification of 'bringing about' or 'busying one's self with' that which is expressed by the noun, or of 'possessing and using' it: **ለበወ**, ($\sqrt{\text{፷}}$) "to possess understanding"; **ሠረወ** "to eradicate"; **ከወለ** "to form the rear-guard"; **ዐመደ** "to erect columns"; **መልሐ** "to salt"; **ጸፈረ** "to pare the nails"; **ዐየነ** "to fix the eye upon"; **ገየረ** "to plaster with lime". In particular, verbs are derived in this way from Numerals: **ሠለሰ** "to do something for the third time", "to be the third"; **ረብዐ** "to form four"; **ዐሠረ** "to give the tithe".

While, however, in the other Semitic languages, the first stem has, as a rule, continued to be used side by side with the second, Ethiopic, by virtue of the frugality displayed in the housekeeping of its forms (§ 4), has mostly given up the first stem, in the case of those verbal notions which it has developed in the second. In point of fact there are only a very few roots yielding a first and

(¹) Which purpose is also served in some cases by one or two of the stronger Intensive Stems: *cf. supra, e. g.* **ገብሰሰ**, **በርደደ**.

a second stem which are both in use together, such as **መስለ** “to be like”, **መሰለ** “to compare”; **ሐጉለ** “to perish”, **ሐጉለ** ⁽¹⁾ “to ruin” (Gen. 35, 4; Numb. 21, 29); **ዐሰሰ** “to hire”; **ጸገዐ** “to be firm”; **ዐርቀ** “to be naked”; **ወገረ** 1 and 2 “to throw” and “to stone”. Besides, in most cases, when both stems are fully formed, there is no longer any essential difference in the meaning, as with **መሀረ** 1 and 2 “to teach”; **ነቀወ** 1 and 2 “to give forth a sound or cry”; **ነለየ** 1 and 2 “to sing”; **ዐሰየ** 1 and 2 “to requite”; **ሐሰሰ** and **ሐየሰ** “to find fault with”; **ጸዕረ** and **ጸዐረ** “to feel pain” &c.

Farther, the roots which have been described in § 71, *a*, of the form **ሠሥዐ**, are dealt with in their formation as verbs of this second stem, seeing that their second radical has to be given as a double letter. But those roots which have made up for the doubling of the second radical by a **ኀ** or **ረ** (§ 72) follow the formation of the Multiliteral Verbs.

3. The
Influencing
Stem.

§ 78. 3. *The Influencing Stem* is formed by the interpolation of a long tone-bearing ⁽²⁾ *ā* after the first radical, and it corresponds precisely to the Arabic Stem III. It is no longer very common in Ethiopic, but in a number of Verbs it is replaced by III, 3 (v. § 82). Besides, the first and second stems of those verbs which have coined this third stem, are either no longer used at all, or only with the same meaning as the third. Meantime, various traces, particularly in isolated Nominal formations (§§ 111 *a. f.*, and 120), show that the Influencing Stem was once used more extensively; and as it serves at the same time as ground-stem to Stems III, 3 and IV, 3, it must doubtless be dealt with in the Grammar as a special Stem. Two kinds of formative principles seem to have co-operated in its production. In part the doubling of the second radical was replaced by a semivowel, which coalesced with a foregoing *a* into *ō* or *ē*: in part an originally exterior causative form, consisting of the prefix **ኣ**, was brought within the word, and this **ኣ** became established as *ā* after the first radical. The Influencing Stem is therefore in the last resort to be regarded, both in origin and meaning, as a variety partly of the Intensive Stem and partly

(1) This form, however, is obsolete, and is always replaced in later times by II, 1.

(2) According to LUDOLF, Verbs *mediae gutturalis* form an exception, in which the second syllable has the tone. According to TRUMPP, p. 522, the tone always rests on the second syllable.

of the Causative⁽¹⁾. It is formed most regularly in Arabic, as is well known, and there it is employed as the strongest Active Stem, particularly in cases where the action is to be represented as one which influences another being and challenges him to a counter activity,—a meaning which is obvious enough in Ethiopic also, in I, 3 even, but particularly in the derived Stems III, 3 and IV, 3:—But other verbs of this Stem in Ethiopic do not go beyond the meaning of the Intensive, or the ordinary Causative Stem. Verbal Stems too which have a formative *ē* or *ō* after the first radical are properly to be referred to this Stem⁽²⁾, thus **ደወ** “to take prisoner”; **ደነወ** “to emit fragrance”; **ቆረረ** and **የዘዘ** (in **አስቆረረ** “to abhor” and **አስየዘዘ** “to make torpid or stiff” § 73); but in farther formation these follow the Multiliteral roots. The other stems belonging to this class have all *ā* after the first radical, which in many of them is certainly original, but in others appears to be shaded out of *ō* or *ē*. This *ā*, however, seems to have been pronounced *ō* in an earlier period of the language, just as in Hebrew, for it passes into *ū* (§§ 18, 20), when the rules of formation require it to be shortened. The verbs of this stem are: **ላሐወ** “to mourn for” (alongside of **ለሐወ** “to mourn”); **በረከ** “to bless” (by means of ‘bending the knee’); **ዋሐየ** “to visit” (وَحَى); **ሣቀየ** “to torment” (سَقَى “to be unhappy”); **በልሐ** “to draw one out”, “to rescue”; **ቋፀረ** (along with **ቁፀረ**) “to lay a snare”, “to surround with snares”; **ላጸየ** “to crop”, “to shave”⁽³⁾; **ሳተፈ** “to make one participate”, (مَعَاذ); **ሳረረ** “to found”; **ቋረፈ** (with **ቀረፈ**) “to flay”, “to lacerate”; **ናፈቀ** “to doubt”, “to play the hypocrite” (نَافَق); **ሳኩየ** “to make for the distance”, “to wander about” (conn. with **ሳኩት**), which is also simplified again into the first stem; **ናዘዘ**⁽⁴⁾ “to console”; **ጣገዐ** “to bind fast” (Zech. 14, 13 var.); **ከደነ** “to cover” (Gen. 9, 23 var.); **ዛወገ** “to be equal”; **ዳደቀ** “to come upon”; **ናሥኦ** “to lead away” (Is. 57, 13 Cod. Laur.); **ዋረሰ** “to take possession of” (ibid.).

(1) V. EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ § 125, a.

(2) Like the Aramaic *Paue* and *Paiel*, HOFFMANN, p. 186. [Cf. *supra* p. 141, Note (1). TR.]

(3) Unless we are to understand here the root **لوص** or **موس** and **የ** according to § 73.

(4) Although this root seems to be closely connected with **آسَى**, **آسَا**, **وَأَسَى**, and the *ā* might thus be otherwise explained.

On the other hand **ጸመወ** “to endure toil and distress” (derived from **ጸማ** “distress”, by § 73), and **ማሰነ** “to decay” (§ 73) are multi-literal roots. Besides the verbs named, several other roots were at one time used in Ethiopic in the third stem, *e. g.*, **ሐቀፈ** “to embrace”; **ጻጸፈ** “to envelop” (*cf.* the forms in § 120); but in the course of time they were allowed to fall back into the first stem, just as some other forms which did not seem absolutely necessary were given up, particularly in later times.

§ 79. II. Causative Stems.

II. Causative Stems:

From the three Ground-Stems which have been mentioned, and leaving their other peculiarities untouched, Ethiopic derives three Causative Stems. It does so by means of one and the same formative device, and in this it develops a certain bent of the language with even more consistency than the other Semitic tongues, including Arabic, which form such a Causative only from the Simple Stem. The device employed consists in prefixing an *ä* to the Ground-Stem, introducing it just as in Arabic and Aramaic by means of the softest breathing **ḥ**. The Causative *a* is no longer attended in Ethiopic with the stronger breathing *h*, by which it is introduced in Hebrew⁽¹⁾. But traces are found which prove that in Ethiopic also a stronger prefix was at one time employed to form the Causative, namely **ተ** (§ 73, Note)⁽²⁾ and more frequently **ሰ** (§ 70 *a. f.* and § 73 *a. i.*), which **ሰ**, in its original form **ḥሰ**, is still quite regularly employed to form the Causative Stems IV, 1, 2, 3. It is possible that **ḥ**, originally **ሀ**, is just a weakened form of this **ሰ** or **ተ**⁽³⁾. In signification the Stems formed with **ḥ** are always Causative, *i. e.* they give expression to the ‘causing or occasioning’ the performance or realisation by some one of the action or dealing expressed in the Ground-Stem.

1. Causative of the Simple Stem.

1. The *first* Causative Stem, of the form **ሐግበረ**⁽⁴⁾, belongs to the Simple Ground-Stem. It is true that often enough the Simple Ground-Stem corresponding to II, 1 does not occur in common use, or else that the second only of these Ground-Stems is still retained

(1) **ሀይመነ** “to believe” is a foreign word:—**הַיְמִין**, **הַיְמִין**, **הַיְמִין**.

(2) **ተርገመ** “to interpret” is a foreign word from Aramaic (HOFFMANN p. 187). [Aramaic borrowed it from Assyrian, and perhaps Assyrian from Sumerian.]

(3) V. on this point EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 122 *a.* *Cf.* KÖNIG, p. 77 *sq.*

(4) According to TRUMPF, p. 522, it is to be accented *aqbāra*.

along with II,1; but any such lack of the Simple Stem rests merely on the contingencies of speech-usage, and so, even in that case II,1 is to be considered as derived from I,1. If the Simple Stem is a semi-passive verb, the Causative turns it into the corresponding active verb, as in **አምጽክ** “to bring”, from **መጽክ** “to come”; **አሐረ** “to cause to go”, from **ሐረ** “to go”;—or it signifies the causing of something to exist either in word or thought, *e. g.* **አርከሰሰ** “to declare and hold as unclean”, from **ረከሰ** “to be unclean”. If the Simple Stem is a transitive verb, the Causative turns it into a double transitive, as **አስተየ** “to give one something to drink”, from **ሰተየ** “to drink”; **አሥዐለ** “to make one paint something”. But not seldom the Causative gives a peculiar and even unexpected turn to the root-idea, *e. g.* **አንበበ** (from **ነበበ** “to speak”) “to read” (as it were, ‘to make the writing itself speak’); **አንፍኅ** “to sound a wind-instrument” (from **ነፍኅ** “to blow”); **አርብሐ** “to lend money in usury” (from **ረብሐ** “to make gain”); **አከሐደ** (from **ከሐደ** “to deny”) “to represent one as a liar”; **አንሥክ** “to take up”, “to waken up”, (from **ነሥክ** “to take”). It is only in appearance that verbs belonging to this stem have now and then an intransitive meaning;—originally and really there is always a Causative sense lying at the foundation of even such verbs: **አዕረፈ** “to rest”, originally “to cause to become drowsy”; **አርመመ** “to be silent”, properly “to maintain tranquillity”; **አድነነ** “to bow”, properly “to cause a bending”. When Stem II,1 occurs along with I,2, the two certainly have often different meanings, as in **መሰለ** “to compare”, “to make similar”, **አምሰለ** “to declare similar”, “to put forth a parable”; **አመረ** “to show”, **አእመረ** “to discern”, “to know” (‘to have something high and clear’); **መከረ** “to form a plan”, **አምከረ** “to counsel”:—but in other verbs the meanings agree, like **ሐጐለ** and **አሕጐለ** “to ruin”; **ነጸረ** and **አንጸረ** “to glance at” (II,1 properly “to cast a glance”); **ደቀቀ** and **አድቀቀ** “to crush in pieces”. More rarely II,1 reverts to the meaning of I,1, *e. g.* **ረድክ** “to help”, **አርድክ** “to give help”, “to help”; **ለጐመ** and **አልጐመ** “to curb”, “to tame”. An instance of II,1 as Causative to I,3 is found in **አልሐወ** “to cause to mourn”, with **ላሐወ** “to mourn for”. Examples of II,1, in cases where none of the three Ground-Stems remains extant, are afforded by **አርጎወ** “to open”; **አውሰበ** “to marry” (צָוַן); **አይደዐ** “to inform” (עָנַן); **አውሥክ** “to answer”; **አፍቀረ** “to love”; **አዕረፈ** “to rest”. Denominatives also are formed in II,1: **አቀጻለ**

“to put forth leaves”, from **ቁጽል**; **አስገለ** “to practise divination” (**ሰገል**); **አብዐለ** “to celebrate a feast” (**በዓል**); **አምላክ** “to reverence God”, from **አምላክ**, and several others.

2. Causative
of the
Intensive
Stem.

2. *The Causative of the Intensive Stem.* This form occurs much less frequently, it is true, than Stem II, 1, but still [though of later formation] it is sufficiently well represented in the language. Intensive Stems which seem to have an intransitive meaning, become active in the Causative form, e. g. **አሠነዩ** ⁽¹⁾ “to beautify”; **አጎደለ** “to strengthen”; **አለበወ** “to make intelligent”, “to instruct”. Others which are already transitive, become doubly transitive, but they also adapt themselves to simpler notions, by means of some new turn:—**አረጸመ** “to order the completion of”; **አገበረ** “to cause one to work at something”, “to compel”; **አከነነ** “to cause to judge”, “to appoint as judge”; **አጸብሐ** “to order one to pay any tax”, “to collect taxes”; **አሐለዩ** “to suggest”. In rare cases, Stem II, 2 reverts in the end to the meaning of I, 2, as in **ገመነ** “to pollute” and **አገመነ** “to cause to pollute” and “to pollute”; **ዐረዩ** and **አዐረዩ** “to make equal”; **መልዐ** and **አመልዐ** “to set out”, “to continue a journey”. Stem II, 2 occurs occasionally, no doubt, along with Stem II, 1, and then, as a rule, it bears a different meaning, like **አገበረ** “to cause one to carry out”, **አገበረ** “to compel”; **አምከረ** “to counsel”, **አመከረ** “to test”: but there are cases in which the two stems occur together, merely in consequence of a certain indecision in the usage of the language. Roots of the type **ሠሥዐ** (§ 71, a) form their Causative in Stem II, 2, e. g. **አጎጉኡ** “to urge to haste”; **አሠሥዐ** “to satiate” (G. Ad.,—inasmuch as **ሠሥዐ** means first “to be insatiable” and then “to eat much”, and so on). This Stem also may be denominative, through the intervention of I, 2, e. g. **አቂረበ** “to administer the Communion” from **ቀርባን**.

3. Causative
of the
Influencing
Stem.

3. *The Causative of the Influencing Stem.* This Causative is of very rare occurrence, as the Ground-Stem itself is but little used. The few verbs which belong to it, so far as yet known, are: **አላቀሰ** “to condole with any one” (**لقس** “to be afflicted”, **لاقس** “to bear with patience”); **አዋከዩ** “to illumine something by its own light”; **አጣዩረ** “to foretell”; and as a denominative, **አዋሐደ** “to unite one thing to another”, “to add (in Arithmetic)”. But **አማሰነ** “to destroy”, **አጸመወ** ⁽²⁾ “to cause trouble to one” (by § 78),

(1) According to TRUMPF, p. 522,—to be accented *ašannāya*.

(2) According to TRUMPF, p. 522,—to be accented *ašāmāwa*.

and **አጣዐዐ** “to worship idols” (derived from **ጣዖት** “an idol”) belong to the Causatives of Multiliteral roots.

§ 80. III. Reflexive-Passive Stems.

III. Reflexive-Passive Stems:

These Stems form the antithesis to the Causative Stems: they convey the action which is expressed in the Ground-Stem, back upon the acting Subject, so that it becomes both Subject and Object at once. But just as in the Indo-European languages the Passive was developed out of the Reflexive, so in Ethiopic also (as in Aramaic and to some extent in Hebrew) the Reflexive came in process of time to serve the farther purpose of a Passive; and this use so completely gained the upper hand in the language, that the other Semitic Passive form, effected by means of internal Vowel-change, almost entirely disappeared. One leading cause of this phenomenon certainly lies in the fact that the short *ũ* or *ö*, to which the inner Passive form specially clung, gradually disappeared from the language. It is only in the Noun (Passive Participle),—in which the Passive *u* or *i* was lengthened into long *ũ* or *ĩ*,—that a remnant of the old Passive formation has been retained. And seeing that in this way the Reflexive served also as a Passive, there was all the more reason in consistency to form such a Reflexive out of all the Ground-Stems. Of the two prefixes, which at one time served to form the Reflexive in Semitic, viz.—*in* (*hin*) and *it* (*hit*), only the latter has continued in use for triliteral roots, while the former is retained merely in the Stem formation of Multiliteral roots. But farther, the prefix *it* (originally no doubt a pronominal element of reflexive meaning) has already been smoothed down in Ethiopic to the simpler **ተ** throughout (just as in Stems V and VI in Arabic).

1. *The Reflexive-Passive of the Simple Stem.* This form, I. R.-P. of the Simple Stem in its twofold utterance, **ተገበረ** and **ተዐቀበ** (cf. *infra* § 97), corresponds to the Arabic Stem VIII and the Aramaic Ethpeel. The greater number of these Stems are both reflexive and passive, e.g. **ተከደነ** and **ተከደነ**⁽¹⁾ “to cover one’s self” and “to be covered”; but many occur only in the one signification or the other. In this matter everything depends upon the usage of the language and upon the fundamental meaning of the Simple Stem. Thus, for instance, **ተከህለ** (from **ከህለ** “to be able”) and **ተሰከነ** (from **ሰከነ**

(1) According to TRUMPF, p. 528,—to be accented *takādna*, *takadāna*.

“to be unable”) can only have a passive sense, “to be possible” and “to be impossible”. But when the reflexive signification has been fully formed, the backward reference is not always so direct and immediate by any means as it is in **ተለብሰ** “to clothe one’s self”, “to put on”, but the Reflexive Stem may also express the ‘doing of something for and to one’s self’, as in **ተሰከመ** “to take anything upon one’s shoulders” (Judges 16, 3); **ተወከፈ** “to see that something be put in one’s own hand”, *i. e.* “to take”; **ተረድዩ** “to oppress any one for one’s own profit”, *i. e.* “to practise usury”. The Reflexive may farther signify the exhibiting one’s self in this or that character, *e. g.* **ተሐበዩ** “to assume the position of administrator and surety”, “to take care of anything”; **ተዐደወ** “to show one’s self to be a transgressor”, “to transgress”. Often several such meanings unite in the same word, *e. g.* **ተከመነ** and **ተከምነ** “to keep one’s self in a believing attitude”, *i. e.* “to trust”; “to entrust (or unbosom) one’s self to any one”, *i. e.* “to confess”; finally, “to become a believer”; or **ተወርሰ** “to take anything to one’s self by way of inheritance”, but also “to be inherited”. Several of these Stems approximate to the Simple Stem in signification, particularly when the latter has an intransitive meaning, *e. g.* **ተመልክ** “to fill itself”, “to become full” = **መልክ**; **ተመደጠ** “to turn one’s self back” (“to return”) = **መደጠ**; **ግሕሠ** and **ተግሕሠ** “to withdraw”. But in many cases the Simple Stem no longer survives by the side of the Reflexive Stem, and the latter serves, like a Deponent, for the first, particularly with words which express emotion, *e. g.* **ተምዕዐ** “to be angry”; **ተሐሥዩ** “to exult”. Even from the examples already adduced it is apparent that many Reflexive conceptions may become transitive by means of a new turn; so too, for instance, **ተዐቀበ** “to be on one’s guard”, but also “to observe”; **ተቀንዩ** “to subject one’s self”, *i. e.* “to serve”; **ተልእከ** “to submit to be sent”, *i. e.* “to perform services for one”, “to serve”.

Since the Reflexive fills also the place of the Passive, Stem III, 1 may farther serve as Reflexive and Passive to Stem II, 1. Thus **ተየድዐ** “to be made known” is the Passive of **ኣየድዐ**; **ተፈቅረ** “to be loved”, of **ኣፍቀረ**; **ተከምረ** “to be recognised”, of **ኣከመረ**; **ተርጎወ** “to open” (*intrans.*) and “to be opened”, the Passive of **ኣርጎወ**. Farther, **ተንሥኣ** “to arise” is the Reflexive of **ኣንሥኣ**, and **ተነበ** means both “to be spoken” (**ነበበ**) and “to be read”

(**አንበበ**). More rarely Stem III, 1 is the Passive and Reflexive of Stem I, 2, *e. g.* in **ተፈክረ** “to be explained”, from **ፈክረ** “to explain”; **ተመጥኑ** “to be measured”, together with **ተመጠነ** III, 2, from **መጠነ** I, 2. This Stem is also employed as a Denominative, *e. g.* in **ተልሀቀ** “to become a presbyter”, from **ልሂቅ**; **ተበኩረ** “to be delivered of the first birth”, *i. e.* “to give birth for the first time”, from **በኩር**.

§ 81. 2. *The Reflexive-Passive of the Intensive Stem.* This Stem in the form **ተፈጸመ** *tafaṣṣama*, corresponds to the Hebrew Hithpael and to the Arabic Stem V, and is likewise of very common occurrence. As regards meaning, all that has been said about III, 1 holds good also for this Stem. Often it has merely a reflexive meaning, *e. g.* **ተክመረ** “to show one’s self”; **ተመክሐ** “to praise one’s self”, “to boast”; **ተጸንዐ** “to harden” (*intrans.*); **ተመጠዐ** “to cause anything to be handed over to one’s self”, *i. e.* “to accept”. Frequently it has only a Passive meaning, like **ተመጠነ** “to be measured”; **ተኑለቂ** “to be numbered”; **ተሐለየ** “to be thought”; but often it has both meanings together, as **ተደመረ** “to mingle” (*intrans.*) and “to be mingled”. It is specially in use with verbs which express emotion: **ተሰፈወ**⁽¹⁾ “to hope”; **ተፈሥሐ** “to rejoice”; **ተወከለ** “to confide”; **ተዐገወ** “to exercise patience”; **ተቀየመ** “to take vengeance”; **ተመነየ** “to wish”, “to long for”. Often quite simple conceptions have been re-developed out of it, as in the last-named instances, and farther in **ተክዘዘ** “to obey” (“to let one’s self be commanded”); **ተመሀረ** “to learn”; **ተወነየ** “to play”; **ተቀበለ** “to go to meet”; and sometimes there is not much difference between its meaning and that of the Ground-Stem, as in **ተሠርሐ** and **ሠርሐ** “to prosper”; **ተነከሐ** and **ነከሐ** “to experience regret”; **ዐረየ** and **ተዐረየ** “to be equal”. By simplifying the idea, it may even take a transitive sense, as in several of the cases mentioned. In conformity with its origin from I, 2, it has in a very special manner the meaning,—‘to be declared something’, ‘to give one’s self out as this or that’, *e. g.* in **ተሐሰወ** “to be convicted of falsehood”; **ተቀደሰ** “to be sanctified, consecrated or declared holy”; **ተዐወረ** “to show one’s self blind to” (“to connive at a matter”); **ተዐየረ** “to appear as a faultfinder”; **ተጸደቀ** “to think one’s self righteous”; so too **ተዐበየ** “to magnify one’s self” (although

2. R.-P.
of the
Intensive
Stem.

(1) According to TRUMPF, p. 523,—to be accented *tasaffāwa*.

በባዩ I, 2 is not in use). When this Stem is developed alongside of **III, 1**, the two stems, as a rule, have different significations, *e. g.* **ተከከረ** “to remember”, **ተከከረ** “to be mentioned”; **ተደመነ** “to become obscure”, **ተደመነ** “to be covered”; **ተገበረ** “to conduct a trade or business”, **ተገብረ** “to happen”. More rarely the usage fluctuates between the two Stems, both having the same signification, *e. g.* in **ተመጥነ** and **ተመጠነ** (*v. supra* and § 97, 2). For several of these Stems the Simple Stems no longer exist, as for **ተቀበለ**, **ተሀዩዩ**, **ተወነዩ**, **ተወከለ**, **ተዐገለ**, **ተመነዩ**, **ተዐገዉ**. This Stem is also denominative in cases by no means rare, as in **ተነበዩ** “to act as prophet”, *i. e.* “to foretell”; **ተዐየነ** “to seek one’s self a well”, *i. e.* “to encamp”; **ተጠየረ** “to observe the flight of birds” (طير); **ተየሀደ** = **ተይሀደ** “to become a Jew”, and several others⁽¹⁾.

3. Reflexive
of the
Influencing
Stem:—
Stem of
Reciprocity.

§ 82. 3. *The Reflexive of the Influencing Stem.* This Stem, with the form **ተከፈለ** corresponds to the Arabic Stem VI. It may also, it is true, have a purely Passive meaning, in those verbs namely whose only Ground-Stem in use is I, 3, like **ተባልሐ** “to be saved”; **ተሣቀዩ** “to be tormented”; or it may have a purely Reflexive meaning, as in **ተላጸዩ** (from **ላጸዩ**) “to shave one’s self”; **ተሳተፈ** “to take a share in a thing”; but these cases are only of rare occurrence⁽²⁾. Almost always the meaning proper to the Ground-Stem inclines to appear in **III, 3**, *viz.*, ‘bringing influence to bear upon another by means of the action expressed in the verb’. It signifies either,—‘to set forth the Subject as influencing others’,—or, if the action is attributed to more than one,—‘to influence one another reciprocally’. It has thus in part come directly into the place of the gradually disappearing Stem I, 3, and in part it serves to denote reciprocal action (*Reciprocity*)⁽³⁾. It is in very frequent use in both references, and may be derived

(1) The following Stems have made their way into Ethiopic writings from the Amharic (*v. ISENBERG*, ‘Grammar’, p. 54, No, XIV):—**ተመያዩ** “to turn hither and thither”; **ተመላለሰ** “to run hither and thither”; **ተደግመረ** “to mingle with”; **ተቃበበለ** “to be hospitable”.

(2) Cases like **ተግሰነ** “to be laid waste” (§ 78); **ተግረዩ** “to act the soothsayer”, from **ግረ**, do not belong to this class, as these Stems come from Multiliteral roots:—*v. infra* § 86.

(3) Frequently however, when several individuals are spoken of, phrases like **በበይናቲሆሙ**, or **አሐዱ ፡ ምስለ ፡ ካልኡ**, are expressly added.

from all the Ground-Stems, or even from derived Stems. This Stem is specially employed to express the ideas of ‘contending, fighting, quarrelling, censuring, disputing (at law)’ and such like, as **ተቃተለ** in the Plural, “to fight with each other”, or in the Singular, “to fight with one”, taking an Accusative, in which case it is presupposed that the person who is fought with displays a counter-activity; **ተቃወመ**, **ተባአሰ**, **ተጋደለ**, **ተፃረረ**, **ተፃብአ**, **ተፋትሐ**, **ተሐየሰ**, **ተሐመየ**, **ተላከደ**, **ተሐመመ**, **ተማዕዐ**. It is also used to convey the ideas of ‘separating, dividing, binding, collecting, cohering’; and some of these verbs may also be used both in the Singular and in the Plural, *e. g.* **ተፋለጠ**⁽¹⁾ “to separate (*intrans.*) from one another”; **ተጋብአ** “to assemble themselves together”; **ተላጸቀ** “to cohere”; **ተራከበ** “to light upon one another”, *i. e.* 1. “to meet one another”, 2. “to be together”. In the very same way Stem III, 3 is derived from many other conceptions, in this sense of reciprocal action, like **ተሳምዐ** “to understand (‘hear’) one another”; **ተማከረ** “to advise together”; **ተማሰለ** “to resemble one another”; **ተናገረ** and **ተባህለ** “to parley together”; **ተራድአ** “to help one another”. Accordingly it may quite as readily be formed from intransitive as from transitive ideas, since even intransitive actions may be attributed to more than one individual in their relations to one another, *e. g.* **ተዋደቀ** “to fall away from one another”; **ተራወጸ** “to flock together”; **ተዋነየ** “to sport with one another”; **ተባዘነ** “to multiply together”; **ተዋረደ** “to rush upon one”:—just as, *vice versâ*, if it is derived from transitive verbs, it is in no wise necessary that the Subjects of the verb should at the same time be its objects, but the Stem may assume an object for itself, *e. g.* **ተከፈለ** not “to divide themselves”, but “to share something among themselves”, **ተሣየጠ** not “to sell themselves”, but “to sell among themselves”, “to exercise trade”, “to purchase something from one”; **ተማሰጠ** “to contend together over plunder” or “to plunder together”. On the other hand it may have a reflexive sense, for instance, in **ተናገረ** “to disengage one’s self”, (while **ተነገረ** has a passive meaning). In several cases, however, the idea of reciprocity retires quite into the background, and then the Stem seems to revert to the meaning of III, 1 or 2; but in these cases also some reference,—at least of a tacit order,—to other persons is included, *e. g.* **ተሣህለ**

(1) According to TRUMPP, p. 523,—to be accented *tafālāṭa*.

“to show one’s self propitious”, “to be gracious” to others; **ተላለቀ** “to mock” at others; **ተላሐዩ** “to adorn one’s self” for others. Or the reciprocity which is expressed is not absolutely bound to refer to the Subject of the action and some other one, but may concern nearer or more remote objects, *e. g.* **ተፋቀደ** “to tell off after one another”, “to muster”; **ተራገፀ** “to kick with both feet”.

This stem too is now and then denominative, *e. g.* in **ተፃፀወ** “to cast lots” (with different rods); **ተቃረኑ** “to attack each other with the horns”; **ተጋወረ** “to dwell together in a neighbourly way”.

About the time that the language was dying out, people began to make this Stem revert to III, 1 or 2 (thus frequently **ተመሐለ** instead of **ተማሐለ** “to conspire”, “to enter into a confederacy”; **ተበሐለ** “to fight”, for **ተበሐለ** &c.),—a phenomenon which, for the most part, occurs only with roots having the first or the middle radical an aspirate, and therefore is to be explained not according to the analogy of the VIIIth Arabic Stem, which here and there also has the meaning of Stem VI, but according to § 48. In such roots also the converse may be met with, III, 3 being written for III, 1, *e. g.* **ተፃቀበ** for **ተፀቀበ**:—Care should be taken to avoid being deceived thereby.

§ 83. IV. Causative-Reflexive Stems.

IV. Causative-Reflexive Stems:—

From the Reflexive Stems Causative Stems are again derived, and this new formation is an embellishment peculiar to Ethiopic, to which Arabic alone, in its Stem X, presents an analogy. Ethiopic is, in this case as well as in the case of the Causative Stems II, richer and more thorough-going than Arabic, inasmuch as it derives new Causatives from all the three Reflexive Stems together. This richer evolution of IV, 1, 2, & 3 brought about the disappearance of several of the simpler Stems in the case of many roots, because the defining of the conception effected by them appeared to be given still more appropriately by means of the form IV. The formative device for these Stems is the syllable **ሐለ**, which is prefixed to the **ተ** of the Reflexive. True, it is open to conjecture, that the prefix **ሐለተ**, characteristic of these Stems of Class IV, should not be analysed into **ሐለ** and **ተ**, but into **ሐት** and **ሰ**, **ሐትሰ** having been turned into **ሐለተ** (ሐሰተ), in old Semitic fashion. But, apart from the fact that such a transposition of letters is not Ethiopic (§ 57), the meaning of Stems belonging to Class IV tells against this ex-

planation, for nearly all of them are Causatives of the Reflexive, not Reflexives of the Causative. That *as* was at one time actually employed in forming Causatives is seen partly in Ethiopic itself even yet, from the forms **አስዎዘ** and **አስቆረረ** (§ 73 *ad init.*), and partly from the Amharic, in which **አስ** still forms simple Causatives⁽¹⁾. And **አስ** thus appears to be the original form for later **ሰ**, exactly as **ሰጥ**, **ሰገ** is the original form for **ተ**, **ገ**⁽²⁾. The new Causative, to be sure, is formed as has been said from all the three Reflexive Stems, but still the form IV, 3 is by far the most common, manifestly because the Stems III, 1 and 2 modify the root-idea frequently in a less special manner than III, 3 does. Accordingly the Causative, which is formed from III, 1 and 2, may be more easily replaced by the simple Causative, than the Causative, which is formed from III, 3. As regards signification, all three Stems express the bringing about of the appearance, or the occurrence, of that which is denoted by the Reflexive,—or they directly express the practising of what the Reflexive describes. A Reflexive must then be always presupposed, although in the ordinary speech such Reflexive has in many cases ceased to exist. Occasionally too the three Stems pass over, the one to the other:—in particular IV, 1 may be formed from III, 2, in place of, or alongside of IV, 2, as, for instance, **አስተፈሥሐ** IV, 2 and **አስተፋሥሐ** IV, 1 from **ተፈሥሐ** III, 2.

(1) ISENBERG, 'Gramm.' pp. 53 & 54, St. 8 & 9; [GUIDI, 'Gramm.', p. 21; 'Zeitschr. für Assyriol.' VIII p. 286 *sqq.*]. Also the Saho has *ös* placed after the root to form Causatives, 'Journ. Asiat.' 1843, Tome 2, p. 116.

(2) TRUMPF, p. 523, N. 2 agrees with the above view. On the other hand the explanation of **አስተ** as being derived from **አት** and **ሰ** is maintained by OSIANDER, ZDMG XIX, p. 240 *sqq.*; XX, p. 206; WRIGHT, 'Ar. Gr.³', p. 46, § 65, rem. [*cf.* 'Lectures on the Compar. Gr.', p. 214 *sq.*]; KÖNIG, p. 79 *sqq.*, and NÖLDEKE, who, in a private communication of the 10th Feb. 1887, observes that even the Arabic **اسْتَفْعَلَ** is used quite preponderatingly in a transitive sense. [In many cases it is directly Causative; *e. g.* **اسْتَخْرَجَ** is often quite synonymous with **أَخْرَجَ**, although the former originally contained a subtle side-meaning. At the most there might be a question whether in **አስተግበረ** the causal **አ** did not come in besides before the *is*. But this *a* was no doubt called forth through the analogy of the other verbal classes.—NÖLDEKE.]

Causative-
Reflexive
Stems 1, & 2.

1. *Causative-Reflexive Stems 1, and 2.* In these Stems the Causative signification is for the most part brought out very clearly and decisively: **አስተግብአ** 1. “to take (by force of arms)” — “to cause that a city **ተገብአ** surrender itself”; **አስተክሐደ** 1. “to induce one to fall away from the faith”; **አስተፅዎደ** “to accustom one to serve” (**ተፀዎደ**); **አስተብረከ** 1. “to make a bending of the knees”, not very different from **በረከ**; **አስተሰፈወ** 2. “to cause one to cherish hope” (**አሰፈወ** “to give one to hope”); **አስተግሐሠ** 1. “to cause to withdraw”. And it is merely in appearance that occasionally they have an intransitive and reflexive look, *e. g.* in **አስተርአዩ**⁽¹⁾ 1. “to cause to appear”, *i. e.* “to reveal one’s self”, “to let one’s self be seen”, “to appear”; **አስተርከበ** 1. “to make one’s self cling to something”, *i. e.* “to busy one’s self eagerly therewith”; **አስተዐገሠ** 2. “to exercise patience”, not very different from **ተዐገሠ** “to be patient” (“to allow to happen to one’s self”). These Causative-Reflexive Stems are also much used to express lasting sentiments and mental dispositions⁽²⁾: **አስተምሐረ** 1. “to be prone to pity”; **አስተወከለ** 2. “to be trustful”, and many others. And since in this way the Causative of Reflexives frequently expresses merely the practising of that which the Reflexive speaks of, the Participle of Stems IV, 1 and 2 may replace directly the participle which is wanting in Stems III, 1 and 2 (§ 114). Among the more common significations of these Stems the two following deserve to be specially noticed: (a) — *to hold, or pronounce as something, e. g.* **አስተንከሰ** 1. “to deem too trifling for one’s self”, or generally, “to deem trifling”; **አስተብፅዐ** 1. “to pronounce blessed”; **አስተአበደ** 2. “to despise one as a fool”; **አስተኀደሰ** 2. “to regard as preferable”, “to prefer”: (b) — *to endeavour to obtain something for one’s self or for others, e. g.* **አስተምሐረ** 1. “to implore pity”, “to intercede” (for another meaning of this word *v. supra*); **አስተሰረዩ** 1. “to entreat pardon”; **አስተበውሐ** 1. “to crave permission”; **አስተበዐለ** 1. “to want to enrich one’s self”; **አስተፍአመ** 1. “to beg for a morsel”. But in other respects also the Stems of this form are distinguished strongly enough from the simple Active Stems, *e. g.* **አስተንፈሰ**

(1) What justification there may be for the forms **አስተርከበ**, **አስተርአዩ**, which are sometimes met with in MSS., but which are purposely omitted in my *Lexicon*,—still awaits investigation.

(2) V. on this point the instructive passage 1 Cor. 13, 3—7.

1. “to inhale” and “to smell” (but also “to cause to breathe again”, “to revive”, like **አንፈሰ**); **አስተገኘሠ** 1. “to discover” (**ገኘሠ** “to seek”); **አስተፅበሰ** 1. “to alarm” (**አፅበሰ** “to weaken”). Occasionally all the other Stems are lost, *e. g.* of **አስተአዘበ** “to make water”.

§ 84. 2. *Causative-Reflexive Stem 3.* Stem IV, 3 forms Causatives, generally from the Stem of Reciprocity III, 3, whether the latter be still retained in the language or not, *e. g.* **አስተፃረረ** “to breed mutual enmity”, “to make certain persons enemies of one another”; **አስተጋብአ** “to collect together”; **አስተጣበቀ** “to glue together”; **አስተባረዩ** “to relieve one”, and “to do something, in turn with others”; **አስተታለወ** “to cause to follow each other in succession”; **አስተባዝዝ** “to cause anything to multiply from itself”; **አስተዋለደ** “to render capable of propagation” (so far as more than one are concerned in it); **አስተኃለፈ** “to make (the hands) pass over each other”, “to cross (the hands)”. It often conveys merely a tacit reference to others, *e. g.* **አስተግዕዐ** “to bear a grudge” (towards others); **አስተሳረዩ** “to be forgiving” (to others); **አስተቃለለ** “to expose to contempt” (from others), **አስተሓወዘ** “to find or to make anything pleasant” (for others and so too for one’s self); **አስተዋሀበ** “to give in restitution”; **አስተፃገረ** “to preserve to the last” (where the comparison lies with some other). Farther, just as Stem III, 3 (by § 82) expresses also the qualifications “in their order”, “gradually”, “the whole in its several parts”, and such like, so the Causative-Reflexive Stem IV, 3 is particularly often employed to denote the ‘doing of a thing by a series of efforts’, the ‘bringing something gradually into being’, as well as the ideas of ‘restoring, adjusting’ &c. This qualification, however, of the idea is brought about merely by the two prefixes **አስ** and **ተ** operating together; and the Reflexive Stem III, 3 hardly ever appears when Stems IV, 3 of such a kind exist, or only appears with a different signification. Examples: **አስተዋፅኦ** “to spend (more and more)”; **አስተሓየወ** “to bring back to life”; **አስተሣነዩ** “to restore”; **አስተራትዐ** “to improve”, “to reform”; **አስተናሥኦ** “to re-establish” (on the other hand **ተናሥኦ** “to rise against another”); **አስተዳለወ** “to prepare”; **አስተናጽሐ** “to purify (in process of time)”; **አስተግወቀ** “to warm”; **አስተፋጠነ** “to quicken”; **አስተፃምኦ** “to discover by hearkening”, “to listen for some time”. Thus Stem IV, 3, as compared with IV, 1 and 2, has several significations peculiar to itself, while on the other

Causative-
Reflexive
Stem 3.

hand it never conveys, or only seldom⁽¹⁾, the two senses of “holding as being this or that”, and “endeavouring to obtain something” (§ 83); but no doubt it is employed, just like the other two Stems, to express permanent sentiments and dispositions, particularly when these involve some reference to others (v. 1 Cor. 13,4 *sqq.*). Accordingly, when the forms IV,1 or 2 and IV,3 are both in use, the meanings are generally distinct from one another, *e. g.* in **አስተሰረዩ** and **አስተሰረዩ** (v. *supra*); **አስተግብአ** and **አስተጋብአ** (v. *supra*); **አስተቀንአ** “to be envious”, so **አስተቃንአ**, yet the latter has also the meaning, “to provoke to mutual jealousy”. There is however scarcely any difference between **አስተቅሰመ** and **አስተቃሰመ**, both meaning “to divine from omens”. **አስተናጉዐ** “to remove the marrow” is derived from a noun (**አንጉዕ** “marrow”), without the intervention of Stem III, 3.

The twelve Stems which have just been described may be derived immediately from trilateral roots, or they may be denominative. But nothing like the full number of twelve Stems are to be found actually derived from any one root. Even in other languages such a case does not occur; and Ethiopic in particular, through its tendency to economise its resources, was in the practice of evolving only one or two of the most necessary Stems from any one root, while it allowed others, which might once have existed, to fall away. The most fully developed Verb in this respect, **ገብረ**⁽²⁾, has only six Stems in ordinary use. As for other verbs, the more fully developed roots have formed one Stem each in the classes I, II, III and IV, and in addition III, 3 as a Reciprocity-Stem. The most of them have generated only one Active Stem, one Reflexive-Passive, and perhaps also III, 3 or one Stem of Class IV. It farther results from the survey which we have been engaged in, that roots, which are in use in one of the three Ground-Stems, may easily pass over to a different Ground-Stem under II, III, and IV, *e. g.* from 1 to 2, or from 2 to 1; but when Stem 2 has established itself from any root, it is generally continued through the Classes II, III, and IV.

(1) For instance in **አስተረከሰ**, properly “to pollute”, then “to esteem unclean.”

(2) Which LUDOLF chose for his Paradigm on that very ground.

2. STEM-FORMATION OF MULTILITERAL ROOTS.

§ 85. How Quadriliteral and Multiliteral roots generally originate, has been pointed out in §§ 71—73, 77, and 78. These sections show also that roots of five letters are, generally speaking, of rare occurrence, while those of six letters are met with only in isolated cases. The four classes of Stems (I—IV), which are employed in the development of trilateral roots, repeat themselves in the Stem-formation of Multiliterals; but the Intensive Stem 2 falls away completely, and the Influencing Stem 3 also disappears in Classes I and II at least. In certain roots, however, a Reflexive Stem,—formed by the prefix **ኣ**, and which the trilaterals have lost—, has been retained. The Scheme of Stems most in use for Multiliteral roots is accordingly as follows:—

Scheme
of
Stems.

Ground-Stem I. Causative Stem II. Reflexive Stems III.

ደንገፀ

ኣደንገፀ

1. **ተመንደበ**

3. **ተሰናሰለ**

Causative-Reflexive Stems IV. Second Reflexive Stem V.

1. **ኣስተሰንኣለ**

ኣንጉደጉደ

3. **ኣስተሰናኣወ**

A few other rarer forms might be added, but it seems unnecessary to enumerate them in the Scheme.

I. Of Multiliteral roots it is only the Quadriliteral which occurs in the *Ground-Stem*⁽¹⁾; and the second letter in the ground-form is always without the vowel, *e. g.* **ደንገፀ**. The place of the second letter is often taken by a long vowel, as in **ማሰነ**, **ደንነ**, **ቶስሐ**. There is no distinction here between transitive and intransitive pronunciation. In meaning, the greatest variety prevails, corresponding to the variety in the genesis of these roots. With reference to the last point the following differences may be observed: **ቀጥቀጠ** “to bruise”,—where the whole root is repeated; **ኣንቀቀ** “to be anxious”,—where there is repetition of the third radical; **ኣንበበ** “to put forth berries”, **ኣርበደ** “to wallow in the mire”, **ዳወወ** “to take prisoner”,—with insertion of a soft letter after the first radical; **ጉንደደ** “to loiter”, **ወርዘወ** “to become a lad”,—with a weak letter annexed; **ደንገፀ** “to be perplexed”,

I. Ground-
Stem.

(1) Only **ጸምሀዩዩ** or **ጸማሕዩዩ** “to wither” seems to form an exception,—from the Quadriliteral **ጸምሀዩ**, the fourth radical being repeated.

ዐንዘረ “to play the harp”, **ቶስሐ** “to mix”,—a formative letter being prefixed; **ማህረክ** “to carry off as booty”, **ሐብረተ** “to make smooth, to polish”, **ሐርተመ** “to be in misery”,—as derivatives from Nominal Stems increased externally; **መንኩሰ** “to become a monk”,—as an example of a foreign word. This diverse origin makes no difference in the formation, for which only the appearance of weak letters in these roots has any significance; cf. § 99 sq.

II. Causative
Stem.

II. The *Causative* is formed, as a rule, by prefixing **ኣ**, just as with the trilateral root. It turns intransitive conceptions into transitive, and transitive into double-transitive, *e. g.* **መርሰሰ** “to grope”, **ኣመርሰሰ** “to cause to grope”; **ኣራጎርጎ** “to soften *or* soothe”; **ኣወልወለ** and **ኣወላወለ** “to perturb”; **ኣጣኣጥኣ** and **ኣጠኣጥኣ** “to dispose in order”. It farther occasionally predicates finer distinctions, as **ጸነወ** “to be fragrant *or* to exhale” in the sense of ‘spreading an odour’, **ኣጸነወ** “to smell” in the sense of ‘inhaling an odour’. The majority, however, of the Causative Stems which occur, are derived from some Nominal Stem (externally increased), for the purpose of expressing the ‘causing, doing, or carrying on’ that which the Noun speaks of &c., like **ኣመስረተ** “to lay a foundation for”, “to establish”; **ኣማሕፀነ** “to hand over to be protected by any one”, “to entrust”; **ኣሠልጠነ** “to give full power to”; **ኣስንበተ** “to keep the Sabbath”; **ኣሌለየ** “to spend the night”; **ኣመንሰወ** “to lead into temptation”; **ኣጣዐወ** “to worship idols”. *Quinqueliteral* roots also occur in this stem, especially those which originate in the repetition of the last two radicals (§§ 71, 77): **ኣርመስመስ** “to seek by feeling for” (‘to wish to discover by feeling’); **ኣድለቅለቀ** “to shake”; **ኣርሳሕስሐ** and **ኣርስሐስሐ** (‘to render turbid’) “to convict of a crime”; **ኣሕመልመለ** “to grow green”; **ኣቅየሐይሐ** and **ኣቅያሕይሐ** “to become reddish” (properly,—‘to acquire that colour’, and accordingly Causative); also **ኣንጦብጠብ** “to drip”, and **ኣንጽፍጽፈ** ⁽¹⁾ “to pour out in drops”; **ኣጎሰርሰረ** “to revile repeatedly”; also a few which only repeat the last radical, but, because they are denominative, have a long vowel following the second radical: **ኣልጥሰሰ** “to whisper gently”; **ኣክጥሰሰ** “to address any one harshly”, “to reproach”.

As relics of an obsolete Causative formation by means of the

(¹) By origin at least, these two belong to this Class. As regards their conjugation, they may quite as well be referred to Stem V.

prefix **አስ** (§§ 79, 83), **አስቆረረ** “to feel horror”, “to abhor”, and **አስዖዘዘ** “to become cramped or benumbed”⁽¹⁾ are still preserved. On the *o*-sound of these words *cf.* § 78. **አስቆቀወ** “to howl” has only an external resemblance to these forms, provided the derivation conjectured in § 77 is correct, and the word not rather founded on a root **ቀውቀወ**.

§ 86. III. Multiliteral roots, like the Triliteral, form their **III. Passive-Reflexive Stems** by prefixing **ተ**. In meaning some are passive, some reflexive, some both passive and reflexive; and the reference back to the Subject of the verb is sometimes direct and immediate, sometimes indirect, just as with the Reflexives described in § 80:—**ተማሰነ** “to be corrupted”, “to be laid waste”; **ተገፍትአ** “to be utterly destroyed”; **ተጥጥሐ** “to cover or veil one’s self”, and Passive; **ተሰሰዩ** “to nourish one’s self with anything”, and “to eat”, with Accusative; **ተቤዘወ** “to ransom one’s self”, and “to ransom for one’s self”, and “to be ransomed”; **ተጸምሀዩ** “to exhibit a dry appearance”, *i. e.* “to put on a sour look”; **ተረገረገ** “to be appeased”; **ተጣአጥአ** and **ተጠአጥአ** “to be arranged”. This Stem occurs often, as it serves at the same time for a Passive form of Quadriliteral roots of Active signification. But it is often enough derived also (like the Causative) immediately from Nominal Stems, *e. g.* **ተመልአክ** “to become a prince”; **ተመርጉዘ** “to lean upon a staff”, and in general terms “to lean upon”; **ተአርወዩ** “to become brutal”, “to be brutalised”; **ተመሥኸዐ** “to chew the cud”; **ተፈለሰፈ** “to philosophize”. Worthy of notice is the word **ተአንሰረ** “to become like an eagle”, because it is derived from a plural **አንሰርት** (**ንሰር** “eagle”), so that in form it resembles the verb **ተአንሰሰ** “to be brutalised” (from **አንሰሳ**). Also noteworthy is the word **ተጳጳሰ** “to become a Metropolitan”, because it has retained the two long *ā*’s from its Stem-word **ጳጳስ** *πάππας*, so that it must rank as a Quinqueliteral verb. No other Quinqueliterals are as yet known. A Sexliterate word appears also in this Stem: **ተአንተልተል** “to be impatient and unwilling”, formed according to § 77 from the Quadriliteral root **አንተል** (§ 72) still in use.

The *Reciprocal Stem* is formed from some at least of the Multiliteral roots. The long *ā*, which is introduced after the first

⁽¹⁾ [Probably, however, this **አስ** is a shortened form of **አስተ**, just as in the Amharic Verbs of the form **አስ**.—NÖLDEKE.]

radical in that formation in Triliteral roots, is consistently established only after the second radical in Quadriliteral roots, since the first and second radicals in such roots are always more closely associated than the others, and together correspond to the first letter of Triliteral roots:—**ተደናጸወ** “to contend enviously with another about anything”; **ተሰናሰለ** “to be linked together”; **ተሰናከወ** “to be in harmony with one another”; **ተሰከተዩ** “to conspire together”; **ተወላወለ** “to be at variance with one’s own mind”, (“to be perturbed in mind”); **ተጠናቀቀ** “to go to work with accurate scrutiny”; **ተዘያነወ** “to announce to one another” (**ዜነወ**); **ተጸኣጽኦ** “to worship”; **ተዐማመቀ** “to engage too eagerly in”; **ተጐናደዩ** “to loiter”⁽¹⁾. In Quinqueliteral roots the long *ā* is introduced only after the third radical, that the most important syllable might not be too near the beginning: **ተልጎዋሰሰ** “to whisper gently to one another”.

IV.
Causative-
Reflexive
Stem.

IV. *The Causative-Reflexive Stem* from these roots occurs very rarely indeed. Since the roots, which are already long enough in themselves must in this case be still farther lengthened by two additional syllables, such a Stem is avoided as far as possible. As yet I know of only four examples of IV, 1: **አስተሰንኦለ** “to grant discharge or leave of absence” (**ተሰንኦለ** “to take discharge or leave”); **አስተኦርወዩ** “to render wild”; **አስተጠኦጥኦ** “to arrange”; **አስተጠንቀቀ** “to explain exactly”,—and the very same number of examples of IV, 3:—**አስተሰናከወ** “to render in accord”; **አስተጐናደዩ** (G. Ad.) “to think one had come too late for a thing”; **አስተወላወለ** “to perplex”; **አስተጠናቀቀ** “to rouse to zeal”.

V. Second
Reflexive
Stem.

§ 87. V. Besides these Stems which are formed both from Triliteral and Multiliteral roots, *another Stem originally Reflexive* makes its appearance, formed by prefixing **ኦን**. In this there may be easily recognised the Hebrew **—נָה**⁽²⁾ and the Arabic **—نَـ** St. VII, employed in the formation of Reflexives and Passives, and originally of a somewhat weaker meaning than **—נה** and **—نَـ**. The *a*-pronunciation is quite as peculiar to Ethiopic as the like pronunciation of **አስ** (§ 83). In Nouns which are derived from this Stem, this

(1) **ተንሕለወ** belongs to Stem III, 1: **ተሓበለዩ**, which LUDOLF, ‘*Lex.*’ col. 42, adduces, is to be explained by § 48.

(2) Cf. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 123, *a*.

an is simplified into *na*, like *as* into *sa*, just as $\text{—}\eta\eta$ or $\text{—}\ddot{\text{z}}$ is always rendered in Ethiopic by **ተ**. But this Stem can by no means be formed from all Multiliteral roots. The language has confined it almost wholly to the roots described in § 71, and in strictness to reduplicated Stems of such roots, which express movement to and fro of any kind, and also of light and sound⁽¹⁾, such as **አንጉድጉድ** “to thunder”; **አንሶሰወ** “to walk about”; **አንኮለለ** “to be giddy”; **አንገለገ** (*angállaga*) “to band together”⁽²⁾. Of other roots only four are known up till now, which form this Stem: **አንጸብረቀ** “to sparkle”, “to shine through” (“to be clear, *or* transparent”); **አንፈርዐጸ** “to spring”, “to dance”; **አንቃዕደወ** “to lift up (the eyes)”; **አንጦልዐ** “to stretch”, “to spread out”; and these come very close, in meaning at least, to the first-named forms. Several of these Stems indicate a transitive signification as well as a reflexive one: **አንኩርኩረ** “to roll” (*transitive* and *intransitive*); **አንገርገረ** “to wallow *or* revolve” and “to drive round” (*trs.* and *intrs.*); **አንቀልቀለ** “to totter” and “to shake” (*trs.* and *intrs.*); **አንሶሰወ** “to go” and “to move”; **አንሳዕስዐ** “to bubble”, “to boil”, also in a transitive sense; **አንሶጠጠ** “to frighten”, “to be alarmed” (*trs.* & *intrs.*). The following have a transitive signification only: **አንጦልዐ** “to stretch out”; **አንዘፍዘፈ** “to expand (the wings)”; **አንቃዕደወ** “to lift up (the eyes)”. Seeing that **አን**, speaking generally, forms weaker Reflexives than **ተ**,—almost pure Intransitives in fact,—and seeing that all these roots, except **ጌገዩ** and **ጉድጉድ**, are used in Stem V only, and that in particular no new Causatives are derived from them, this phenomenon might without difficulty be attributed to a gradual transition from the intransitive to the transitive meaning, and in most cases perhaps this explanation might suffice. A Passive-Reflexive, however, of some of these formations occurs, formed by means of **ተ**: **ተንጦልዐ** “to be stretched out”, “to stretch one’s self out”; **ተንኩርኩረ** (according to LUDOLF) “to be rolled about” (*cf.* the words beginning with **ተን**, § 73). It seems to follow from this that the instinct of the language conceived the **አ** of **አን** in several of these formations as being **አ** Causative, as if these were new Causative forms from Nominal

(1) Even LUDOLF teaches that this Stem expresses *impetum quendam vel motum reciprocantem*.

(2) The rest are: **ጌገዩ**, **ሳሕስሐ**, **ሳዕስዐ**, **ቀልቀለ**, **በልበለ**, **ባሕብሐ**, **በስበስ**, **ኩርኩረ**, **ገርገረ**, **ጉርጉረ**, **ጠልጠለ**, **ሶጠጠ**, **ጦለለ**, **ዛህለለ**.

Stems beginning with **ኀ** (by § 85, II)⁽¹⁾. Accordingly the process may be thought of as taking the following course: **ኀንከርከረ** “to roll” (*intrs.*);—**ኀንከርኀር** “rolling”; Causative **ኀንከርከረ** “to roll” (*trs.*); **ተንከርከረ** “to be rolled”. A certain want of clearness in the consciousness of the language is unmistakeable here⁽²⁾. The formations which are derived from Nominal Stems without the intervention of a Causative (by § 86, III), **ተኀንገደ**, **ተኀንሰሰ** are not to be confounded with Passive Stems like **ተንጦልዐ**; for here, just as in **ተኀንሰረ**, **ተኀንተለ**, **ተዐንበሰ**, the **ኀ** is treated as a radical.

II. FORMATION OF TENSES AND MOODS.

General
Remarks.—
Uses of the
Perfect.

§ 88. In the formation of Tenses, Ethiopic like the rest of the Semitic languages, proceeds from the twofold, and not from the threefold division of time. To that original stand-point it has always adhered. Every action or event is conceived as presenting itself either in a finished—and thus realised—state, or in an unfinished state⁽³⁾. In conformity with this contrasted view of things, only two Tenses have been formed, the one,—the *Perfect*,—to express the finished or completed action, the other,—the *Imperfect*,—to express the unfinished or uncompleted action. To this category of the incomplete, however, there belongs not only that which is happening in the Present, as well as that which is only to be realised in the Future,—so that the Ethiopic Imperfect, generally speaking, corresponds at once to the Present and the Future of other languages,—but also that which is merely *thought of* and *willed*, that

(1) [That **ኀ** did actually come in before the *in* in these Nif'al forms, appears plain also from the fact, that the Stems under discussion (*cf. supra*) have for the most part a transitive, or causative signification. Words, like “to thunder”, “to sparkle”, are to be explained exactly like **ኀንከርከረ**, **ኀንከርኀር**, **ኀንከርከረ** &c, properly “to produce light” &c. In the positively Reflexive nature of the *in* or *na*,—one inclining to Passive (and in Hebrew and later Arabic actually becoming Passive),—it would be a very singular thing if the transitive signification had introduced itself thus in Ethiopic without farther assistance.—NÖLDEKE.]

(2) In Amharic all this is met with in quite the same fashion, though more frequently employed than in Ethiopic; *cf.* ISENBERG, p. 54 No. XXIV; p. 56 Nos. VII—X; p. 60 No. VII; [and GUIDI, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ VIII, p. 258 and Note 3.]

(3) V. farther on this point EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 134.

which *may* or *must* be realised. Accordingly the Imperfect here becomes also the source of the formation of the so-called Moods of the Verb, through which the conditions of will and necessity are expressed. In Ethiopic, just as in the other Semitic languages, moods are formed from the Imperfect only. The Perfect has produced from itself no special moods. Farther, the moods which have been formed from the Imperfect⁽¹⁾ are only two in number. With these few tense-forms and conditional forms of the Verb, Ethiopic is able to convey the force of all the much more richly developed Tenses and Moods of the Indo-European languages.

1. As regards the two Tenses⁽²⁾, the *Perfect* serves first of all and most frequently (*a*) to express the *Past*. Every action which the speaker regards as having happened, or as being past, from the point of time of his speaking, he expresses in this tense. It is the tense therefore which is usually employed in narration. If an action has to be marked as concluded in the past (as in the Greek Perfect), the Perfect also must suffice for this. In isolated cases only, where Germans would use *schon* or *bereits* ('already') along with the Perfect, the Ethiopian may also put ወደክ "he has completed"⁽³⁾ before the Perfect (and, according to § 180, 1 *a* α, without a ወ), *e. g.* ወዳእኑ፡ ቀተርኒ "we have (already) shut" Luke 11, 7; [ወዳእኑ፡ ርኢኩ "I have seen already" Hen. 106, 13]⁽⁴⁾. Farther, the language has nothing but the Perfect to represent an action as already past at a certain point of time in the Past

(1) [It is perhaps unfortunate that DILLMANN employs the same word—*Imperfect*—, both as a generic term for the *Tense* which is contrasted with the *Perfect*, and as a specific term for the formation which is now regarded as that *Mood* of the Imperfect Tense which is differentiated from the *Subjunctive*. It would have conduced to clearness, if like PRAETORIUS and others he had restricted the term *Imperfect* to the *Tense*, and used the term *Indicative* for the *Mood*. TR.]

(2) On the question whether the Semitic Perfect is only a later developed form, *cf.* HAUPT, '*J. Am. Or. Soc.*', Vol. XIII, pp. LIV, LXI *sq.*, and on the force and signification of the Perfect in contradistinction to the Imperfect, the somewhat prolix explanations of KNUDTZON, '*Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*' VI, p. 408 *sqq.*, & VII, p. 33 *sqq.*

(3) In like manner ﷲ is always prefixed in Arabic; EWALD, '*Gr. Arab.*' § 199 *sq.* But the usage mentioned is not so common in Ethiopic. Besides, ወደክ may also be placed after the verb, *e. g.* ጸልመ፡ ወደክ John 6, 17.

(4) [This is FLEMMING's reading, —not DILLMANN's, who reads merely ወርኢኩ. TR.]

(*Pluperfect*); and it has to be gathered, merely from the context and the sense of the passage, whether one action has taken place before another in the Past, or not. Thus the Perfect may most readily stand for the Pluperfect in accessory sentences, particularly in circumstantial clauses, *e. g.* Gen. 31, 34 (accessory to vs. 33 and 35); **ከነ፡ ይቤ** “he had said”, Gadla Adām 90, 13; or in sentences which are introduced by the relative pronoun, *e. g.* **ወርእዮ፡ ነሱ፡ ዘገብረ** “and he saw all that he had made” Gen. 1, 31; **ዘከነ፡ አቀጥ** “that he had set up” Gadla Ad. 147, 20; **ዘከነ፡ ይሰመይ፡ መልአክ፡ ወናይ** “who had been called ‘Good Angel’” Hexaemeron (ed. TRUMPF, Munich 1882), 36, 20 sq.; or by relative Conjunctions like **ሶበ, እምድጎረ, እምአመ** (also **እምከነ፡ ይሰራ፡ ሎቱ** “then he would have forgiven him” Gadla Ad. 90, 18). (b) Comparatively seldom does the Ethiopic Perfect serve to express Present time, and for the most part in the two following cases merely. (1) When a transaction has already begun, starting from the Past, and is continued up to the Present, the Perfect is employed, *e. g.* **በክርስቶስ፡ ተጎድጎ፡ ለነ፡ ጎጢአትነ** “our sin is forgiven us for Christ’s sake”; and the use of the Perfect is obligatory, when a Future cannot be thought of as taking its place without an alteration in the sense, *e. g.* **ናሁ፡ ቀርቦ፡ ዘያገብአኒ** “Lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand” Matt. 26, 46. Certain actions especially, for which we would use the Present, are mostly expressed in the Perfect, because the Ethiopian conceives them as not so much ‘a state of being’, as ‘a mode of doing or becoming’, *e. g.* **አእመርኩ** “I know” (‘I have learned’); **ርአኩ** “I see”; **አፍቀረ** “he loves”. In particular the verb **ሀለወ**, “to be”,—in the sense of “he is there”, or “he is present”, almost always occurs in the Perfect, where in our tongue we employ the Present. (2) The other case is met with when an action coincides with the very moment of its announcement in present speech. Such an action the Ethiopian regards as completed with the very utterance of the word, and therefore he puts it in the Perfect, *e. g.* **ናሁ፡ ፈናኩክ** “Lo, I send thee” Judges 6, 14; **ናሁ፡ ወሀብኩክ** “Behold I give thee” Gen. 23, 11; **ናሁ፡ አማሕፀንኩክ** ἰδοὺ παρατίθεμαι σοι Tob. 10, 12⁽¹⁾. On the other hand general truths, practices, and customs are expressed mostly by the Imperfect, less frequently by the Perfect. (c) The Perfect is employed even to express *Future* actions, first of all in conditional clauses

(1) [*Cf. Kebra Nag.*, Introduction, p. XX.]

and relative clauses of equivalent import, when the future action has to be represented as preceding another action, which is placed still farther on in the future,—a case in which other languages with greater accuracy use the *Futurum exactum*:—**ሁሉ ለሕዝቡ ይቀጥላል** “every one who findeth (shall find) me shall slay me” Gen. 4, 14; Mark 16, 16; Matt. 23, 12; Gen. 40, 14; [cf. also Hen. 14, 6 (**ርእሰሙ**); 62, 15 (**ተንሥኡ**)]; (cf. *infra*, § 205). So too by dint of a lively imagination, the speaker may transfer himself to the future in such a fashion that a matter appears to him as already experienced and accomplished:—it is upon such a conception that the *Perfectum propheticum* in Hebrew is based, a usage which occurs often in exactly the same way in Ethiopic, in Biblical and kindred writings, e. g. Hen. 48, 8; 99, 1; and in looser diction, e. g. **ህየ፡ ህሉ፡ ብካይ** *ékai éstai klavθmós* Matt. 8, 12, just as we too can say: “thére—is crying out”, instead of “thére—shall be crying out”. In conditional, desiderative, and similar clauses, the Ethiopic Perfect corresponds also to the Moods of Preterites in other tongues (§ 205).

§ 89. 2. *The Imperfect*, as the means of expressing uncompleted actions, serves (a) to denote, above all, the *Future*. The Imperfect is the readiest and (with the exception of the cases noticed in § 88, 1 c) the only mode of expressing the Future, whether (1) the Absolute Future, like **ይከውን** “he will be”; **ዘይመጽእ፡ ዓለም** “the future world”, or (2) the Relative Future, both (a) the Future as regarded from a certain point of time in the past, e. g. “he held his peace to see **እመ፡ ይሢርሐ፡ እግዚአብሔር** whether God was to grant him success” Gen. 24, 21, and (b) the Future which precedes another future occurrence (*Futurum exactum*), e. g. **አይትቀተል፡ እስከ፡ አመ፡ ይቀውም፡ ቅድመ፡ ዐውድ** “he shall not be put to death, until he stand (‘shall have stood’) before the judgment-seat” Josh. 20, 6. But in the latter case the Perfect occurs much more frequently (§ 88). Farther, as the Moods, according to § 90, serve only to express what is contemplated or purposed, the simple Imperfect⁽¹⁾ is employed to signify any doubtful, uncertain or conditioned

Uses of the Imperfect.

(1) [DILLMANN seems to regard those modifications of the Imperfect Tense, which are presented in the *Subjunctive* and its offshoot—the *Imperative*, as constituting the two proper *Moods* of the Ethiopic Verb (cf. § 90), while his “plain” or “simple” Imperfect (= the Indicative) is suggested as standing outside

Future, *e. g.* “take no thought **ዘትበልዑ** *τί φάγῃτε*” Matt. 6, 25; “settle for me thy wages **ዘአሁበክ** ⁽¹⁾ which I am to give thee” (‘as thou thinkest’) Gen. 30, 28; “he set apart a present **ዘይወስድ፡ ለዒሳው** which he would *or* could send to Esau” Gen. 32, 14. In the same way it is used,—in Conditional clauses,—of any future event which is put merely as possible, *e. g.* Matt. 11, 23 (§ 205). Even the Future of Will may be expressed in the plain Imperfect, particularly when a decided and stringent command has to be given, taking the form “thou wilt do it” in place of “thou shalt do it”. For some other finer modifications, however, in the predicating of a matter in the future, the Ethiopic language employs periphrastic forms, contributed to by the auxiliary verb **ሀለወ** “to be”. Whenever a future transaction has to be represented as continuing in the Future, the Perfect **ሀሎ** or **ሀለወ** is joined to the Imperfect of the principal verb, somewhat like *amaturus est* in Latin; and the Imperfect, as containing the main determining idea, takes the first place, *e. g.* **ይጸሐፍ፡ ሀሎ** “there will continue to be recording” Hen. 98, 7; 104, 7; **ይትሀገሉ፡ ሀለወ** “they will perish” (‘be perishing’) 52, 9; **ዘይከውን፡ ሀሎ** “what will be in the future” 52, 2. But the principal verb may also follow the auxiliary, *e. g.* **አንተ፡ ሀለወት፡ ትትፈጸም፡ ዲበ፡ ምድር፡ በመዋዕሊሁ** “which (*f.*) shall be done on the earth in his days” Hen. 106, 18; *cf. ibid.* 99, 2. Naturally too the same periphrasis may have the sense of a Future just impending (*Futurum instans*), *e. g.* **ይመጽእ፡ ሀሎ** “he is about to come” Hen. 10, 2; **ትሰጠም፡ ሀለወት** “it (*f.*) is on the point of sinking” 83, 7. Meanwhile, precisely to indicate the last-mentioned variety of modification of the Future, a periphrasis,—made up of **ሀለወ** and a suffix pronoun (with the force of a *Dat.*) followed by the Subjunctive of the principal verb,—has become more usual, and is very frequently employed ⁽²⁾, *e. g.* **ዘሀለዎ፡ ይምጸእ** *ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι* Matt. 11, 14; 17, 10; **ሀለዎ፡ ያግብአዎ** “they will (shortly) deliver him up” Matt. 17, 22,

of the sphere of Mood, and as being a mere counter-balance of the Perfect Tense. It would conduce to clearness of nomenclature, as well as to accuracy, to follow PRAETORIUS and other scholars, in holding the General Imperfect Tense as being divided into two *Moods*, viz. (1) the *Indicative* (= DILLMANN'S Imperfect), and (2) the *Subjunctive*, including the *Imperative* as a sub-form. TR.]

(1) On the other hand **ዘአሁበክ**, which might also stand, would mean—“which I am to give” (‘as thou hast determined’).

(2) The Greek *μέλλων* is also expressed in this way.

and similarly in 2, 13; 17, 12; Hen. 104, 5. Still more frequently some definite shade of the Future,—as in the notions of *will*, *shall*, *must*,—is expressed by this device, inasmuch as **ሀለወ** with a suffix means “it is incumbent on one to—”, *e. g.* **ምንተ፡ ትግበሩ፡ ሀለወክሙ** “what will you do (then)?” Hen. 97, 3; 101, 2; **ሀለወክሙ፡ ትርሐይዎ** “you will be obliged to see him”, “you must (then) see him” Hen. 55, 4; 98, 12; Matt. 16, 21; Gen. 15, 13; 18, 19; Ex. 16, 23;—similarly **ካኑ፡ . . . ይስግዱ** “they had to worship” Gadla Ad. 147, 18 *sq.* Occasionally the suffix pron. for **ሀለወ** is wanting, as in Hen. 100, 8; and **ሀለወ** stands also, although comparatively seldom, after the Subjunctive, Hen. 104, 5.

(b) But, by its very conception, the Imperfect expresses also *that which is coming into being*, that namely which already is in process of becoming, but which is not yet completed. (α) It is therefore the most obvious tense, and the one most frequently employed, to indicate the *Present (Praesens)*, especially when the action of the Present is not one which passes by in one moment, *e. g.*:—“tell John **ዘትሰምዑ፡ ወዘትሬእዩ** what you are (at this very time) hearing and seeing” Matt. 11, 4. And it is so much in common use for Present time, that even the Present Participle is usually expressed periphrastically by this tense: **ዘይዘርእ** “a sower”, “sowing” &c. (“who sows” Impf.); or **ርኢክዎ፡ የሐውር** “I see him go” (‘going’—‘that he is going’—). And where usages, customs, and actions, which are continuous or which are often repeated, are delineated, the Imperfect is always summoned to take the duty first; and it is comparatively seldom that the Perfect is used instead. (β) But, just as frequently and usually, *that which was coming into being in the Past* is denoted by this tense, and then it answers quite regularly to the Latin *Imperfectum*. Whenever in narration an action has to be represented as continuing, or as being gradually accomplished, or as being repeated, the Imperfect is used throughout: “the governor was wont to release some one at the feast” **ያለምድ፡ አሕይዎ** Matt. 27, 15; **አካኑ፡ ይነድደነ፡ ልብነ፡ ዘከመ፡ ይነግረን** οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὥς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν; Luke 24, 32; **ዘልፈ፡ እነብር፡ ምስሌክሙ፡ ወእሚህር** “continually I sat with you and taught” Matt. 26, 55; **እምአሚሃ፡ ይፈቅድ፡ ይርከብ፡ ሣኅተ** “from that time he sought (continually) to find an opportunity” 26, 16; Gen. 27, 41; 25, 21; in the description of the manners of Noah’s time, Matt. 24, 38 *sq.*, and similar instances in

Matt. 4, 23, and Gen. 2, 6. The Imperfect is therefore the tense of circumstantial clauses, in which the accessory circumstances, accompanying the main action, are described, whether they are introduced by **ወ**, **እንዘ**, or in some other way, *e. g.* **እንዘ፡ ይበልዑ፡ ይቤ** “while they ate, he said” Matt. 26, 21; **ወው-እቱሰ፡ ይነውም** “while he slept” 8, 24; Gen. 3, 8; **ሀለው፡ ዕራቃኒሆሙ፡ ወኢየጎፍሩ** “they were naked and were not ashamed” Gen. 2, 25. In smoothly flowing narration also, statements which describe anything of a circumstantial nature appear in the Imperfect, *e. g.* **ወሀለው፡ ብእሲ፡ ወይነብር፡ ውስተ፡ ደብረ፡ ኤፍሬም፡ ወነሥኦ፡ ሎቱ፡ ብእሲተ** Judges 19, 1. If, however, duration in past time has to be expressed still more precisely, so as to bring into more distinct prominence the notion of the customary character of an action, or its coincidence with some accessory circumstance or other, then the language has once more at its disposal, for this purpose, the periphrasis constituted by **ሀለው** or **ኮነ** “to be”, followed by the Imperfect of the verb concerned⁽¹⁾:—*e. g.* **ኮነ፡ ይገብር፡ ግብረ፡ ብርት** “he was wont to fabricate implements of brass” Gen. 4, 22; **ወሀሎ፡ ዮሐንስ፡ ያጠምቅ፡ በገዳም** “John baptised, (‘used to baptise’) in the wilderness” Mark. 1, 4; **ወሎጥሰ፡ ሀሎ፡ ይነብር፡ ወስተ፡ አንቀጽ** “just while Lot was sitting in the gate” Gen. 19, 1; 18, 22; **ኮንኩ፡ እባርኩ፡ ለእግዚአ፡ . . . ወናሁ** “I was just praising God . . . , when lo (they called me)” Hen. 12, 3; **ኮነ፡ ይትፈሣኝ** Gadla Ad. 95, 28; **ኮነ፡ ይደሉ** “it was fitting” = “it would have been fitting” Gadla Ad. 90, 21; but also **ኮነ፡ . . . ጎደሩ** “*habitabant*” Gadla Ad. 103, 9; and even **ነበሩ፡ ይሕንጹ** “they kept on building” Gadla Ad. 164, 1 *sqq.* [and **ነበርኩ፡ እጼሊ** “I kept on praying” *Philosophi Abessini* (LITTMANN) 20, 23]. In contrast to the similar periphrasis for the Present in the Future (v. *supra*), **ሀለው** and **ኮነ** must stand first here. A case, different from those which have hitherto been described, arises when the speaker or narrator transfers himself into past time in so lively a manner that he represents it as passing at that very moment, or as being present to himself and his hearers (*Praesens historicum*). In such a case, actions may be described in the Imperfect, which in less lively narration would necessarily have been expressed in the Perfect. This turn of speech is not very common in Ethiopic; but upon it depends the universal use of **ይቤ** “he said” (literally, “says he”) in narration.

(1) Just as in Arabic: EWALD, ‘*Gr. Arab.*’ § 208.

§ 90. From the Imperfect, as the expression of uncompleted Derivation of the Moods from the Imperfect Tense. action, or of action coming into being, are farther derived the *Moods* (§ 88 *in init.*). Ethiopic has developed only two. In particular, if the action coming into being has to be set forth as one that is willed (whether it is one that is founded in the will of the acting Subject or in the will of another), then this condition is denoted by a special form of the Imperfect, which we shall henceforth call the *Subjunctive*. The Subjunctive stands wherever the expression of purpose, or of will or wish is in question. It stands not only in dependent and subordinate clauses, but also in simple and direct deliverances, and therefore it has at once the force of a Subjunctive and a Jussive. It is accordingly employed in plain command (unless the Imperfect⁽¹⁾ is preferred, by § 89), either with an introductory conjunction, as in **ለይኩን፡ ብርሃን** “Let there be light!” Gen. 1, 3, or without it, as in **ያውስስ** “he shall marry” Matt. 22, 24 (for the second person, however, the Imperative is used). Farther it appears as a Cohortative, *e. g.* **ንንድቅ** “Let us build!” Gen. 11, 4, and in wishing, as in **እግዚአብሔር፡ ይዕቀብከ** “The Lord preserve thee!” Ps. 120, 4. Even in Interrogative clauses, it makes its appearance, whenever the action is conceived as one which is willed by some one, *e. g.* **እኅድግኩ** “am I to abandon?” Judges 9, 9; **እር፡ እግበር፡ ለዝንቱ፡ ነገር** “how can I act in this way (that you require of me)?” Gen. 39, 9; and so in all other sentences of whatever kind, *e. g.* **አእመርን፡ ከመ፡ ንሰብሐ**⁽²⁾ “we know that we must praise him” Hen. 63, 4, whereas **ከመ፡ ንሐብሐ** means “that we shall praise him”; or **አልቦ፡ ዘይስማዕ፡ ቃሉሙ፡ መኑሂ** “there is no one whatever, who is to hear their voice”, *i. e.*: ‘no man must hear it!’ Josh. 6, 10. Quite as frequent or still more frequent employment is found for the Subjunctive in dependent or subordinate clauses, which attach to the main clause the object aimed at or only some purposed result, whether the purposed action (or result) may be *immediately* subordinated to the main action, as in **አዘዘ፡ የሀቡ** “commanded (he) that they give” Matt. 19, 7, **ኅድግ፡ ንርአይ** “allow that we see” *i. e.* “let us see”, 27, 49; **መጽአ፡ ይኅሥሥ** “he came to seek” 18, 11; or be subordinated *by means of a relative pronoun*, as in “they sought false witnesses **በዘ፡ ይቅትልዎ** through

(1) [That is to say,—the Indicative. TR.]

(2) [Flemming's edition reads:—**ንሰብሐ**. TR.]

whom they might put him to death" 26, 59; or *by means of a conjunction*, as in **አገበሮሙ፡ ከመ፡ ይዕርጉ** "he constrained them to go up into" 14, 22 &c. Accordingly it must stand regularly after certain final Conjunctions, particularly after **ከመ** "in order that", and suchlike, and farther, after those which contain the idea of "before", "not yet" (§ 170), *e. g.* **አምቅድመ፡ ይብቁል** "before it (*i. e.* 'herb or grass') grew" Gen. 2, 5,—because in such clauses lies the meaning that there is something to come about, or to be *determined*, but that it is not yet realised⁽¹⁾. On all these cases, which are merely indicated here, v. *infra* in the Syntax.

The Imperative is a special ramification of the Subjunctive, and has been developed out of it. Although it may be formed from all verbal stems, it is only used in the second person, and never in a subordinate relation, but only in direct speech by way of command, wish, request &c. It takes the place of the second person of the Subjunctive, so far as the latter is Jussive. But since it admits of absolutely no subordination to any other conception, and can only be set down as an independent summons, it is again replaced by the Subjunctive as soon as the summons is preceded and conditioned by a negative.

General
Rules of
Formation
in the
Perfect
and
Imperfect
Tenses.

§ 91. *The formation of these two Tenses and Relations (Perfect and Imperfect) of the Verb* is effected by the co-operation of two formative expedients. The one consists in *the different way of attaching to the Stem the additions which form the Persons of the Verb*. Seeing that a Verbal stem, on entering upon the process of Tense-formation, at the same time brings to view of itself the distinction between the persons, there is actually no Tense-formation without Personal-formation; and thus the Semitic tongue was enabled to make use of Personal-formation as a means also of Tense-formation. The contrast between the Perfect and the Imperfect is in fact given expression to by the contrast presented by the two possible positions of the signs used in indicating the Persons. In forming the Perfect the Personal sign is attached to the end of the stem, so that *e. g.* **መልአት** means:—"full (is) she"; but in forming the Imperfect it is attached to the beginning of the stem, so that *e. g.* **ትመልአ** means: "she (is about to be) full". In the latter case the action is represented as something still standing *before* the person, in the former as something already set *behind*

(1) Cf. the like in Arabic: EWALD, '*Gr. Arab.*' § 210.

the person; and by this device the essential difference between the two Tenses is hit off with great subtlety. Along with this formative expedient is associated the second, *viz.*—*Internal Vowel-Change*. This change is very simple in Ethiopic, as it now lies before us:—In all Stems of active signification the characteristic vowel following the second-last radical, if it is *ě* in the Perfect, passes into *ǎ* in the Imperfect, and if it is *ǎ* in the Perfect, into *ě* in the Imperfect. But in Reflexive Stems, which at the same time serve as Passives, and generally are closely allied to the Passive, this change is either not carried out at all⁽¹⁾, or only to a partial extent. For by another rule which takes effect here, the Passive must take, in the Imperfect, *ǎ* in the place where the Active has *ě*. This *ǎ* prevails without exception in the Imperfect of the stronger Reflexive Stems; and it was due only to the fact that some had introduced into the Perfect an *ě* instead of *ǎ* in the critical position, that there emerged a farther partial change between Perfect and Imperfect. On the other hand the weaker Reflexive Stem V (belonging to the Multiliteral Roots) exhibits the same change as the Active Stems. Both the Tense-forms originally possessed,—in those Persons, to which no formative addition was appended,—a vowel-ending (just as in Arabic), which, following the distinction of the tenses, must have changed between *a* for the Perfect and *e* (*u*) for the Imperfect. Such vowel-ending constituted a farther mark of distinction between the two tenses, and served also to distinguish Moods in the Imperfect Stem, by different pronunciation. But Ethiopic soon gave up entirely the vowel-ending of the Imperfect at least, *i. e.* the *e* (just as it did the termination of the Nominal Stems, § 38), while it regularly⁽²⁾ preserved the ending *a* in the Perfect. And so by this difference a new contrast is brought about between the two Tenses:—The Perfect has a fuller vowel-expression; the Imperfect ends with the last radical in the forms mentioned.

⁽¹⁾ And just as little in the Arabic Stems V and VI.

⁽²⁾ It is only in the one Perfect **UΛ̣**, used for **UΛ̣** "to be", and occurring quite as frequently in the latter form, that the *ǎ* has been thrown off or has blended into an *ō*, so that it resembles the form of expression of verbs *tertiæ infirmæ* with the Syrians. That the distinction in meaning between **UΛ̣** and **UΛ̣**, which LUDOLF sets up in his '*Lexicon*', is incorrect, has been already pointed out by DRECHSLER. [On the slight variation of this final *ǎ* in the Abyssinian dialects, v. NÖLDEKE, "*Beitr. z. sem. Sprachwiss.*", p. 15, Note 2.]

Older Form
of Imper-
fect Tense]
used as the
Subjunctive
Mood.—
Fuller
Form as
the pure
Imperfect
[= the In-
dicative
Mood.]

In the other Semitic languages, if they possess Moods at all, such Moods are formed from the Imperfect, partly by modification of the final vowel and of the personal-endings, and partly by shortening; and in the most ancient times this appears to have been the case also in Ethiopic. But in still early days the final vowels here must have fallen away; and the fuller endings which are still retained in Arabic, must have been greatly curtailed and abbreviated, so that they became incapable of showing by themselves, through farther abbreviation, the distinction of Moods. But now, while Hebrew,—which so far had followed nearly the same course as Ethiopic,—either gave up entirely the distinction of Moods, or expressed it by shortening interior formative-, or radical-vowels, and by cutting off final radical-vowels, Ethiopic took a different path. It kept the old form of the Imperfect, curtailed as it was, for the Subjunctive, and from it fashioned a new and *fuller* form for the Imperfect [or Indicative]. It compensated for the vowels and nasals discarded at the end, by interpolating an *a* in the stem itself after the first radical (and in the case of the Multiliteral verb, after the third-last radical) ⁽¹⁾. Thus there arose a new Mood-distinction, and a form of the Imperfect which diverges from the Imperfect-forms of all the other Semitic languages [with the exception of Assyrian]. And, since the Imperfect [or Indicative] thus depends upon a later formation, and the old form is represented rather by the Subjunctive, we must, in discussing this class of forms, start always with the Subjunctive as the Ground-form. The Imperative proceeds from the Subjunctive, with which it is intimately allied in meaning, the Personal sign of the 2nd pers. Subj. being discarded from the beginning of the same. In every other respect the Imperative agrees completely with the Subjunctive: only, in one or two verbs of the First Stem it exhibits farther and more pronounced abbreviations.

In the several roots and stems these general rules of formation are applied in the following manner.

(¹) Like the method followed in Ethiopic in the inner Feminine formation of one or two Adjectives, where formative vowels, which originally were attached externally, forced their way into the interior of the form (§ 129). On the corresponding forms in Assyrian, v. BARTH, '*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*' II, p. 383 *sq.*, and HOMMEL, ZDMG XLIV, p. 539. On the like in the Arabic dialect of Zanzibar, v. PRAETORIUS, *ibid* XXXIV, p. 225. Cf. also KÖNIG, p. 82; PHILIPPI, '*Beitr. z. Assyriol.*' II, p. 383 *sq.*, and REINISCH, '*Die Bedäuyeh-Sprache*', Vol. III, p. 136 *sqq.*

§ 92. I. 1. In the simple Ground-Stem of the Tri-radical Root, the Transitive and Intransitive modes of pronunciation are differentiated, in accordance with § 76. In the former the Perfect is given as **ḡḡḡ** (*nagára*) “he spoke”; in the latter, as **ḡḡḡ** (*gábra*) “he was active”. In the Subjunctive the characteristic vowel takes up a position after the second radical, the first and third having no vowel. The Personal sign for the 3rd pers., **ḡ**, by § 101, unites with the first radical to form a syllable with the help of the vowel *ě*. The formative vowel after the second radical is *ě* for Transitive verbs, according to § 91 (to which *ě* the *i—e*, and *u—o* of other tongues have been reduced), and *ǎ* for Intransitive. Thus the corresponding Subjunctives are given as **ḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡ**, with the accent on the first syllable: *yénger*, *yégbar*⁽¹⁾. The Imperative has the sound **ḡḡḡ** and **ḡḡḡ** *negér* (or *néger*?), *gebár*. The Imperfect⁽²⁾ [or Indicative] anew interpolates an *a* after the first radical, by which proceeding the Personal sign is isolated, and it is then pronounced with a mere vowel-touch (*Sh^eva*). The new vowel takes the accent, and so greatly dominates the word that an *ǎ*, in the syllable following it, must be reduced to *ě*, thus:—**ḡḡḡ**, **ḡḡḡ** *yenáger*, *yegáber*. The distinction between a transitive and an intransitive pronunciation accordingly disappears in this case. Meanwhile,—just as in the other Semitic languages,—there are several verbs in Ethiopic which merely in one of the two tense-forms follow either the transitive or the intransitive form⁽³⁾; while

I. Tense and Mood Formation in—1. Simple Ground-Stem. — Transitive and Intransitive Pronunciation.

(¹) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 530; KÖNIG, p. 158 sq.—In Tigrāi a short vowel is inserted after the first radical, in the Subjunctive (PRAETORIUS, ‘*Tigrīna*’, p. 276 Rem.; SCHREIBER, ‘*Manuel de la langue Tigrāi*’, p. 37), which NÖLDEKE (GGA 1886, No. 26, p. 1014) regards as original.

(²) [V. Notes to §§ 88, 89, as to DILLMANN’s nomenclature of the Moods:—to be kept in view in what follows. TR.]

(³) [DILLMANN means that there are several Ethiopic verbs which are neither solely transitive in form nor solely intransitive, throughout both the Perfect and the Subjunctive. So far as can be made out from what follows, the different varieties under this relation would be:

1. Tr. in Perf. and Tr. in Subj.	} regular
2. Intr. „ Intr. „	
3. Intr. „ Tr. & Intr. „	
4. Tr. & Intr. „ Tr. & Intr. „	
5. Tr. & Intr. „ Intr. „	
6. Intr. „ Tr. „	
7. Tr. „ Intr. „ TR.]	

on the other hand there are some which fluctuate between the two forms in the Subjunctive, just as according to § 76 several verbs admit of both even in the Perfect. The following verbs fluctuate between the two forms of pronunciation in the Subjunctive:—**ቀርብ** “to draw near”, **ይቅረብ** and **ይቅርብ**; **ኅልቀ** “to pass away”, **ይኅለቅ** and **ይኅልቅ** (v. Gen. 8, 3); **ዐርገ** “to ascend”; **ፀንሰ** “to be pregnant”; **ጸልመ** “to be dark”; **ደከመ** “to be tired”⁽¹⁾. The verb **ሰከበ** and **ሰከበ** “to lie down” forms both **ይሰከብ** and **ይሰክብ**; **ፈተወ** and **ፈትወ** “to wish”, both **ይፍተው** (**ይፍቶ**) and **ይፍትው** (**ይፍቱ**). On the other hand, of those verbs which shift about in the Perfect between the two forms, some exhibit in the Subjunctive the Intransitive form exclusively, or at all events in the great majority of cases:—**ይምሰል** “may he be like!”; **ይኅበር** “let him be connected!”; **ይስክል** “let him ask!”; **ይፍረይ** “let him be fruitful!”. The following have only the Intransitive form in the Perfect, and only the Transitive in the Subjunctive:—**ነግሠ** “to be king”, **ይንግሥ**; **ገዝፈ** “to be thick”, **ይገዝፍ**; **ነፍጸ** “to make escape”, **ይንፍጽ**. Contrast with these the following, which have the Transitive form in the Perfect and the Intransitive in the Subjunctive:—**ረከበ** “to find”, **ይርከብ**; **ነበረ** “to sit”, **ይንበር**; **ዐቀበ** “to keep”; **ዐቂረ** “to wrap up”; **ዐተበ** “to bless with the sign of the cross”; **ከዐወ** “to pour”. The Imperative invariably follows the Subjunctive.

T. and M.
Formation
of
Aspirate
Verbs.

(1) Of the *Aspirate Verbs* those which have an Aspirate as their first letter have only this peculiarity, that, by § 44, they furnish the Personal sign of the Imperfect with the vowel *ä* instead of a fugitive *ë*: **የዐርግ**, **የኅብር**, **የዐቅብ** &c.⁽²⁾

(2) *Those which have an Aspirate as their final letter*, whether they be transitive or intransitive, have all, by § 45, the form in the Perfect **መልአ** “to be full”; **ሠርዐ** “to set in order” (*mál'a*, *šár'a*); and likewise, in the Subjunctive, seeing that here the Aspirate by rule requires *ä* before it instead of *ë* (§ 44), they have only one form of pronunciation, lengthening this *ä* into *ā*, by § 46: **ይምላእ**, **ይሥራዕ**, **ይብቃዕ**,—Imperative: **ምላእ**, **ሥራዕ**, **ምጸእ**, **ስማዕ**. But

(1) [*Cf. also Kebra Nag.*, p. XXXI, sub **ዐጠነ** and **ዘከረ**.]

(2) On the other hand, after **ኢ** “not”, **ይ** appears as a result of retrogressive Assimilation, e. g. **ኢይሐድረ** “they (*f.*) do not dwell”; v. *Könlä*, p. 118 sqq.

they exhibit no peculiarity in the Imperfect: **ይመልክ**, **ይሠርሕ**, **ይበቀሕ**.

(3) *Verbs with an Aspirate for their middle letter* run, when transitive, like **ለክክ** “to send”; **ሰሐበ** “to draw”, but when intransitive, by § 45, like **ልህቀ** “to grow”, **ከሕደ** “to deny”, **ንኦሰ** “to be little”: Several vary between the two forms (§ 76). In the Subjunctive these roots also have *ä* instead of *ě*, on account of the Aspirate (§ 44),—so that from transitives and intransitives alike we have the formations **ይስሐብ**, **ይከሐድ**, **ይስዐር**, **ይምሐር**. In the Imperative, however, one says regularly, by § 44, **ሰሐብ**, **ከሐድ**, instead of **ስሐብ**, **ከሐድ** &c. The Imperfect, by § 45, takes the form **ይስሕብ** *yeséheb*, instead of **ይሰሕብ**⁽¹⁾; and similarly **ይጽሕፍ** “he writes”; **ይልህቅ** “he grows”; **ይድኅን** “he saves himself”; but **ንዋዕል** appears, as well as **ንውዕል** Gen. 33, 14 *var*.

Only a few roots in frequent employment, having weak Aspirates, exhibit peculiar forms here. **ርኣየ** “to see” has the form **ይርኣይ** in the Subj., but, by § 46, it lengthens **ይርኣይ** into **ይሬኣ** in the Imperf.; and in the same way II, 1 **ያሬኣ**; Imper. **ርኣ** and **ረኣይ**. It is imitated now and then by **ርዕየ** “to herd”, Imperfect **ይሬዒ**; but this formation is not founded in the nature of the **ዐ**; and the better class of manuscripts usually have **ይርዒ** for it (*cf. infra* § 94). Farther **ስኣነ** “to be unable” might lengthen its *ě* in the Imperf., thus **ይሴኣን**, as appears from LUDOLF’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 172, although, as a rule, it forms **ይስኣን**; *cf.* DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 377. Then the root **ህላ** “to say” (little used now in the Perfect) discards its **ሀ** in the Subj. and Imperf.: accordingly we have the Subj. **ይበል** (for **ይ-ህላል**), and the Imper. **በል**. In the Imperfect the *ě* is at the same time lengthened into *ē*, after the manner of the foregoing instances: thus we get **ይቤል** (§ 46); and, as **ል** is cut off in all those Persons, in which it would become the final letter (§ 58), the result is **ይቤ**. But seeing that this **ይቤ** is invariably used (§ 89 *ad fin.*) with the force of a Preterite, “he said”, the language fashioned a new Imperfect **ይ-በል**, for **ይ-ህላል**, in the sense—“he says” and “he will say”. In like manner although the Subj. of **ከህላ** “to be able” is given in full **ይከህላል**, the Imperf.

(1) So that the form,—to judge by the written character,—coincides with the Subjunctive of strong Transitive verbs. In pronunciation it is essentially different from it.

is usually shortened into **ይክል** (*yekel*); but **ይክህል** occurs also, v. I Kings, 26, 25. Roots in which two Aspirates meet together are rare (§ 66): **ብሕክ** “to become sour”; **ኣኀኀ** “to take”, “to catch”⁽¹⁾. The latter forms the Subj. **ይኣኀኀ**, Imper. **ኣኀኀ**, Imperf. **ይኣኀኀ**. The Subj. **የኣኀኀ**, which LUDOLF found in an old manuscript, Ps. 15, 6 and 34, 9 (*cf.* also John 7, 30) and for which he printed **የኣኀኀ** (as Subj. of St. I, 2), may perhaps be explained by **ይኣ** having been spoken at one time like **ኣ**.

§ 93. Of roots with doubled final letter (**ሃ''ሃ**) the Transitive Perfect is pronounced like **ኀሠሠ** “to seek”; **ነበበ** “to speak”; and the Intransitive, like **ሐመ** (*hámma*, for **ሐምመ** *hám^ema*, § 55) “to be ill”, “to suffer”. Some take both modes of expression:—**ነደደ** and **ነደ** “to burn”; **ሐጸጸ** and **ሐጸ** “to become small”, “to decrease”; **ጐየየ** and **ጐየ** “to flee”. From these come the Transitive Subjunctives **ይኀሠሠ**, **ይነበበ** (**ይሕትት**, **ይስድድ**, **ይግስስ**);—also from **ጸበበ** “to compress” and “to be narrow”, **ይጽብብ**,—Imper. **ኀሠሠ**, **ነበበ**, **ስድድ**,—but the Intransitive **ይነደድ**, **ይጐየዩ**⁽²⁾, **ይዕየዩ**⁽³⁾; Imper. **ንደድ** &c. The Imperfect is pronounced **ይነድድ** *yenáded*, **ይነበበ**, **የኀሠሠ** (§ 92).

Of Roots beginning with a Vowel, the only one beginning with *i* which is as yet vouched for in this Stem (Simple Ground-Stem) is **የብስ** (*intr.*) “to be dry”, Imperf. **ይየብስ**, Subj. **ይይበስ**, Imper. **ይበስ**. But those which begin with *u* are numerous. Transitive and Intransitive forms are found in the Perfect:—*e. g.* **ወለደ** “to beget”, **ወገረ** “to throw” and “to stone”, **ወረደ** “to descend”, **ወሰደ** “to lead away”; **ወደቀ** (rarely **ወደቀ** Numb. 14, 5) “to fall”; with middle Aspirate: **ወሕዘ** “to flow”, **ወኅደ** “to become few”, **ወኅጠ** (and **ወኀጠ**) “to gulp down”, **ወሀበ** “to give”; with final Aspirate: **ወግክ** “to butt”, “to push”; **ወፅክ** “to go out”. Only a small number of these preserve the initial *u*-sound in the Subjunctive, hardened into a semi-vowel in the combination **ይው** (§ 49), whence in transitive form **ይውግር** (Lev. 24, 16; Deut. 22, 24), **ይውርቅ**, **ይውፍር**, **ይውቅር**, **ይውጥን**, **ይውሩ**, **ይውቅስ** Acts 19, 33;

(1) **ኣኀረ** has Subj. I, 2 **ትኣኀር**, according to a single reading in Ex. 22, 28, in the sense “to delay”; other MSS. have II, 1.

(2) Also **ይጐየዩ** Numb. 10, 34.

(3) [For the form **ይጽነን**, along with **ይጽንን**, from **ጸነ**, **ጸነነ** “to be inclined” v. *Kebra Nag.* 117 b 12.]

of Aspirate roots: **שׁוּג** Hen. 89, 43; **שׁוּג** (“to suck”) Hebrews 5, 12. In the majority of cases the sound, — **שׁוּ**, which is not much in favour, is simplified by rejecting the **וּ** (§ 53), and then, when the verbs are transitive, the second syllable is strengthened by assuming *ā* instead of *ē*. True, the form **שׁוּג** (*yesēd*) also occurs, *e. g.* in Gen. 27, 10, Note; Ps. 42, 3; but usually *ā* prevails: — **שׁוּג**⁽¹⁾, **שׁוּג** John 8, 7 (as well as the above-mentioned **שׁוּג**), **שׁוּג** (the *u* being retained in this case after the preformative), **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**; just as in the Intransitives **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**. From middle-Aspirate verbs, **שׁוּג** (§ 44); **שׁוּג** Luke 19, 5; **שׁוּג** Ps. 68, 18; **שׁוּג**. From final-Aspirate verbs, **שׁוּג**. Whenever the first radical has fallen out in the Subjunctive, it ceases also to appear in the Imperative, thus **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**; and from forms like **שׁוּג**, comes the Imperative **שׁוּג** Ex. 33, 12; Gen. 42, 19 (although now and then **שׁוּג** is also found, as well as **שׁוּג**). But even from **שׁוּג** there is derived, by rejecting the first radical, **שׁוּג** Ex. 1, 22 (—yet we have also **שׁוּג**, and **שׁוּג** from **שׁוּג**, *v. Notes ad loc.*): and similarly we say **שׁוּג** (from **שׁוּג** “to hew”) Deut. 10, 1, as well as **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**, and **שׁוּג** Ex. 34, 1, *v. Notes*⁽²⁾.

The Imperfect of all these verbs uniformly runs thus: **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**, and from Middle-Aspirates, **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג** &c. Only, the much employed word **שׁוּג**, by transposing the *u*-sound in **שׁוּג** *yewéheb*, invariably takes instead of it the form **שׁוּג**⁽³⁾.

Roots mediae infirmæ of both kinds, — *i. e.* both with *i* and *u* as middle radical —, do away with (§ 50) the *ā* or *ē* in the *Perfect*, which ought to make itself heard after the second radical, thus obliterating any distinction between a Transitive and an Intransitive form of pronunciation. They invariably blend their vowel-radical with the formative *ā* of the first syllable into a mixed sound: **שׁוּג** “to bear”, “to carry”; **שׁוּג** “to run”; **שׁוּג** “to go”; **שׁוּג** “to set”; **שׁוּג** “to turn”; **שׁוּג** “to pass the night”; and so too when the

Verbs
m.d. inf.

(1) Cf. **שׁוּג**, **שׁוּג**; PHILIPPI, ZDMG XL, p. 653.

(2) Some of the verbs concerned here are not yet supported by examples in all the forms.

(3) In accordance with § 68, this may be regarded as a transition from a Vowel-beginning Root to a Vowel-centred one; but in that case it must be assumed at the same time, that here the old form of the Imperfect, which elsewhere took the meaning of a Subj., continued to be retained.

verb is at the same time *tertiæ gutturalis*: **ጥአ** “to conquer”; **ሰአ** “to come”; **ጸአ** “to make a way”; **ቂአ** “to be red”⁽¹⁾. It is only those, which are at the same time vowel-ending, that take another form, § 94. When LUDOLF in his *Lexicon* cites forms like **ተወነ**, **ኅወሠ**, **ፀወገ**, **መየሰ**, **ረየፀ**, **ሰየበ**, **ሰየረ**, **ደየነ**, he has given them this shape only, because he had not yet met with their more exact expression in the Perfect, in the course of his reading. The forms of the Perfect **ገየረ**, **ፈየተ**, **ፀወሰ** are vouched for, it is true, but they appear to represent Stem I, 2⁽²⁾. The *Subjunctive* from roots *mediae i* takes throughout, by § 50, the form **ይሚጥ**, **ይሢም**, **ይሂድ**, **ይሢል**, **ይጠዕ**, **ይሒስ** Matt. 11, 20; Jude 9:—*Imperative* **ሚጥ**, **ሢም**, **ሢሕ** Is. 40, 2. Roots middle *ū* also nearly all have the form described in § 50:—**ይጸር**, **ይሩጽ**, **ይዑድ**, **ይሠዕ**, **ይኑኅ**; *Imperative* **ጸር**, **ዑድ**, **ሠዕ**. Also, **ኮነ** “to be” has mostly **ይከን** in the *Subjunctive*, and **ከን** in the *Imperative*; but, according to §§ 26 and 36, these forms may be still farther shortened into **ይከን** and **ከን**. It is, however, unmistakeable that an intransitive form existed also at one time in the *Subjunctive* and *Imperative*, at least in roots *mediae ū*, and that this form caused the intransitive vowel *a*,—which has to be given after the second radical,—to remain still audible⁽³⁾.—It is most frequently preserved still in **ይሐር**, **ሐር**, particularly in older manuscripts, though later ones generally have **ይሐር**, **ሐር**: So too with **ይጸር** and **ይጸር**⁽⁴⁾. It may be met with too in other instances here and there, *e. g.* in **ሶቅ** = **ሱቅ**; v. DILLMANN'S ‘*Lexicon*’. In roots *mediae i*, such differentiation of an intransitive form cannot yet be authenticated, even for more ancient times. Finally, the *Subjunctive* of the two roots **ሰአ** “to come” and **ጥአ** “to conquer” were perhaps at one time also pronounced **ይሰአ**, **ይጥአ**; but, under the influence of the final Aspirate, *ō* passed over, in accordance with § 44, into an un-

(¹) Cf. the Arabic *Imāla*; KÖNIG, p. 67; BARTH ZDMG XLIV, p. 698. [The *Imāla*, of course, is the ‘deflection’ of the *a*-sound towards the *i*-sound; v. WRIGHT'S ‘*Ar. Gramm.*’ 3rd ed. I, p. 10 C. TR.]

(²) This cannot be determined with certainty before the relative Imperfect-forms have been found.

(³) It is distinguished from the Transitive form, just as **סִיבַּ** is from **סִיבַּ**, or **يَكْخُافُ** from **يَقُولُ**.

(⁴) [V. also *Kebra Nag.* ‘*Introd.*’ p. XVII.] V. on the other hand KÖNIG, p. 151 sq.

alterable *ā* (§ 46), whence we invariably have **ደባአ**, **ደግአ**, and in the Imperative **ባአ**, **ግአ**⁽¹⁾. The Imperfect of all these roots, of both kinds, whether transitive or intransitive, is formed precisely as in the strong verb; but the vowel-radical which follows the interpolated (v. § 92) and accented *ā* must be hardened into a semi-vowel, thus: **ደከውን**, **ደጸውር**, **ደነውን**, **የዐውድ**, **የሐውር**, **ደበውአ**, **ደወይም**, **ደቀይሕ**, **የሀይድ**, **የሐይስ** Rev. 2, 4. (On the pronunciation v. § 50).

§ 94. *Roots tertiae infirmæ* of both kinds (with *ī* and with *ū*) sound the final *a* in the 3rd pers. Sing. of the *Perfect*, just as all the other roots do, and thus regularly harden their vowel-radical in this position (§§ 51, 68). It is only in one or two instances that an Intransitive form occurs in the *Perfect* from roots *tertiæ ū*, and in these instances the second radical is either an Aspirate, or a vowel or semivowel:—**ተለወ** “to follow”; **ፈተወ**, more rarely **ፈትወ** “to lust after”; also **ከዐወ** “to pour out”; **ሰሐወ** “to extend” (*neut.*); on the other hand **ጽሐወ** “to awake” (*neut.*); **ምሀወ** “to melt” (*neut.*); and so too the doubly weak root **ሐይወ** “to live” (originally *hāyewa*, more shortly *hāiwa*); cf. *infra*. In roots *tertiæ ī*, however, the distinction between the transitive and the intransitive modes of pronunciation is regularly indicated in forms **ሰረየ** “to pardon”; **ሰመየ** “to name”; **አበየ** “to refuse”; **ኅረየ** and **ኅርየ** “to elect”; **ፈረየ** and **ፈርየ** “to bear fruit”; **ሰትየ** “to drink”; **ዐብየ** “to be big”; **በልየ** “to grow old”; **ርእየ** “to see”; **ርዕየ** “to feed”, “to herd”; **ንሀየ** “to recover” (*n.*); **ውዕየ** “to burn”. In the *Subjunctive* the short *ē* of the transitive form is dislodged by the third radical, § 51, and therefore we have **ደትሉ** (for *yette-ū*); **ደእቱ**, **ደግሉ**, **ደዕጹ**, **ደዕጹ**, **ደዝሩ**, **ደንቁ** Matt. 26, 34; and others;—**ደበከ** “to weep”; **ደከሪ** “to dig”; **ደስከ** Deut. 4, 42; **ደርቁ**; **ደጥሲ** Ex. 32, 10; **ደሕሊ** “to sing”; **ደእሪ**, **ደዕሲ**, Ps. 130, 4. But the *ā* of the intransitive form, as well as the *ā* of roots middle-Aspirate, retains its position, and forms a diphthong with the radical which follows it; thus constantly with a following *ī*;—**ደስረይ**; **ደስተይ** (now and then in the transitive form **ደስተ**); **ደኅረይ**;

Weak
Verbs con-
tinued:—
Verbs tert.
inf.

(1) If it were only **ባአ** that had this formation, it might also have been accounted for in accordance with § 68, *a* [—an explanation which might be still retained, if we consider **ደግአ** to be an analogous formation to **ደባአ** (v. § 103).]

ይብለይ; **ይገነይ** (from **ገነየ**); **ይጥዕይ**; **ይገህይ**; **ይርአይ**, **ይርዕይ**:—also with a following *ū*, in which case, it is true, the diphthong often turns into the mixed letter *ō*: **ይፍቶ** Ex. 20, 17. After an Aspirate, however, the diphthongal form is more closely adhered to, although it is not invariably retained: **ይጽሐው**; **ይስሐው**; **ይከዐው**. Accordingly the *Imperative* takes, in some cases, the form **ትሉ**; **ዕጹ**; **ጽሉ**; **ዕዱ**; **ዕሲ**; **ኅሊ**; **ርቂ**; and in others, the form **ከዐው** (§ 44) and even **ቅኖ**, Rev. 3, 19 (Old Ed.); **ገነይ**; **ብለይ**; **ስተይ** (and in transitive form **ስቲ**); **ረዕይ**, *e. g.* John 21, 15, 16⁽¹⁾. But **ርእየ** “to see”, although it has always **ይርአይ**—never **ይርአ**—in the Subjunctive, yet takes the shorter (transitive) form in the Imperative, viz. **ርአ**.—The form **ረአይ** or even **ርአይ**, which is read here and there, is not a good reading. In the *Imperfect* the *č*, which should be uttered after the second radical, is regularly dislodged by the succeeding vowel, thus: **ይተሉ**, **ይፈቱ**, **ይገሉ**, **ይዘሩ**, **ይነቁ** “to sound”, **የዐዱ**, **የአቱ**, **ይስቲ**, **ይፈሪ**, **ይሰሚ**, **የኀሪ**, **የዐቢ**, **የዐሲ**. From roots middle-Aspirate (by § 45): **ይከዐ**, **ይገዐ**, **ይቅኑ**, **ይጽሑ**; **ይጥሢ**, **ይርሢ** (and **ይፊሢ**, § 92), **ይልሐ** (Liturg., from **ለሐየ**); but **ርእየ** has always **ይፊሢ**, § 92; and in the Berlin Manuscript of Henoch [Cod. “Q” in FLEMMING’s edition] **ይጭሢ** always appears for **ይወሢ**, *e. g.* 93, 8. Now though these forms of the Imperfect, from middle-Aspirate roots, coincide with the Subjunctive forms of verbs which are not middle-Aspirate, there still is no possibility of mistaking the one for the other, because the latter forms have always a corresponding Imperfect with *a* in the first syllable, and the former always a Subjunctive with *a* in the second.

Verbs
Doubly
Weak.

As regards *Doubly Weak Roots* (§ 69), **ጉየየ** and **ዐየየ** have been dealt with already in § 93. Of those which are both vowel-beginning and vowel-ending, **ወደየ** “to put in” forms the Subj. **ይደይ**; Imper. **ደይ**, **ውዲ**, and **ውደይ** (Herm. p. 81 b. l. 7); Imperf. **ይወዲ**; **ወዕየ** “to burn” forms the Subj. **የዐይ** (§ 44); Imperfect **ይወሢ** (the Imper. is not yet vouched for); and **ወሐየ** forms **ይወሐ** (v. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’, col. 893). The solitary root which has both middle *i* and final *u*, viz. **ሐይወ**, exhibits no peculiarities which the foregoing account could not explain; it has the Subj. **ይሕየ** and **ይሕየው**; Imper. **ሕየ** and **ሕየው**; Imperf. **የሐየ**. Roots which have both middle *u* and final *i* take a transitive form in the Per-

(1) [For the occurrence of **ዕሐው**, **ልብው** v. *Kebra Nag.*, Introd., p. XVII.]

fect: **ደወየ** “to be ill”; **ሠወየ** “to rub the ears of corn”, “to ripen”; **ረወየ** “to quench one’s thirst”, Gen. 24, 22; **ጠወየ** (or **ጠውየ?**) “to make windings”;—Imperf., **ይደዊ**, **ይሠዊ**, **ይረዊ**, **ትጠዊ** (2 *sg.* *m.*, Ps. 17, 29); Subj. (not supported for all of them) **ይድወይ**.

§ 95 2. *The Intensive Ground-Stem* is given in the *Perfect* with three *a*’s, of which the one that follows the second radical is the essential and determining one, and therefore (according to LUDOLF and TRUMPP) it has the Tone: **ፈጸመ** *faṣṣâma* “to complete”. As the second radical must be doubled, the strong formation always appears, even with the double-lettered (**ሃሃ** or *med. gem.*) and the vowel-centred (*med. voc.*) roots, thus: **አዘዘ** *azzâza*, “to command”; **አወዘ** *hawwâza*, “to be agreeable”; **ጠየቀ** *ṭayyâqa*, “to investigate strictly”⁽¹⁾; and the same formation, of course, occurs with the other roots:—*e. g.* **ወረወ** “to throw”; **ሐለየ** “to think”; **ፈነወ** “to send”. But roots which have an Aspirate for their last letter take, in accordance with § 45, the form **ሰብሐ** *sabbêha*⁽²⁾, “to give praise to”; **ጉጉአ** *guagguêa*, “to be in haste”, “to be eager”; **ጸውዐ** *ṣawwê’a*, “to call”; **የውሀ** *yawwêha*, “to show clemency”. In the formation of the Subjunctive, the Personal Sign is put in an isolated position and is therefore uttered with a Vowel-touch (or *She’eva*), because the first radical, along with the first half of the second and doubled radical, forms one single unalterable, closed syllable; and, instead of the *a* of the Perfect, there appears in the determining position (*i. e.* after the second radical) in the Subjunctive a toneless *ě*, which is suppressed by a closing radical-vowel, thus: **ይፈጸም** *yefâṣṣem* or, in the case of an initial Aspirate, **የሐድሰ** “to renew” *yahâddes*; or, with a final Aspirate, **ይሰብሕ**, **ይጉጉአ**. From weak roots we have **የአዝዝ**, **ይኩንን**, **ይየብብ**, **ይወልጥ**, **ይወድስ**, **ይጸውዕ**, **የሐውጽ**, **ይየውሀ**, **ይወውዕ** *yewâwwê* (Josh. 6, 5): **ይጠይቅ** *yetâyyeq*; **ይፈኑ**, **ይዘሙ**, **የሀሉ** *yahállû*, **ይወሩ** (from **ወረወ**); **ይጸሊ**, **ይረሊ**, **የሐሊ**. Imperative-forms are **ፈጽም** *fâṣṣem*, **አዝዝ**, **ወልጥ**, **ጸውዕ**, **የውሀ**, **ወውዕ**, **ጠይቅ**, **ፈኑ**, **ጸሊ**, **ረሊ**. Only, as a result of a shortened and inaccurate pronunciation (§ 56), **ይጠይቅ**, **ጠይቅ** and the like may have the sound of *yetaiq*, *ṭaiq*. The middle-Aspirate roots ought

Tense and Mood Formation in—
2. Intensive Ground-Stem.

⁽¹⁾ Thus too **ሠየኑ**, **ሐየሰ**, so far as they belong to St. I, 2; not **ሄኑ**, **ሐሰ**.

⁽²⁾ LUDOLF, ‘Gramm. Aeth.’ II, 2.

properly to have formed a Subjunctive after the type **ይመህር** *yemáhher*, "(that) he teach"; and, in point of fact, in this case *á* is still retained in a number of instances before the double Aspirate, in old manuscripts and impressions (*e. g.* Deut. 4, 9, 36; 6, 1); but even for this case, the expression which is preferred is, in accordance with § 45, **ይምህር** *yeméhher*, Imper. **ምህር**, *e. g.* Ps. 118, 26, 64:— In later pronunciation, in which the Aspirates came to be uttered less and less clearly and distinctly, these forms easily degenerated into *yeméhr*, *méhr*, § 56.

In other respects these two Moods have nothing peculiar in their formation. It must however be kept in mind here, that several roots admit Stem I, 1 and Stem I, 2 in the same meaning; in particular, **ወገረ**, **መሀረ**, **ጸዐረ**, and some others besides, v. § 77, *ad fin.* Meanwhile, to form the *Imperfect* an additional *a* is inserted after the first radical; and the double sound of the radical, which follows the resulting long vowel, becomes inaudible, and is made up for by shading off the *ā* into *ē* (from *ā + i*). Accordingly the Imperfect [or Indicative] of this Stem, in all classes of roots, is uniformly produced by establishing an *ē* after the first radical, thus: **የፈጽሞ** *yefēsem*⁽¹⁾, **ይሔድስ**, **ይሚህር**, **ይሔብሕ**, **ይኮንን**, **ይዩብብ**, **ይዌልጥ**, **ይዌውዕ**, **ይሔውጽ**, **ይጤይቅ**, **ይፈኑ**, **ይሄሉ**, **ይሄኒ**, **ይጸሊ**, **ይሔሊ**. This *ē* of the Imperf. is at the same time the surest external mark of all the Intensive Stems.

T. and M.
Formation
in the
Influencing
Ground-
Stem.

3. In the *Influencing Ground-Stem* the *ā* which contains the force of the Stem bears the Tone throughout, except that when the second radical is an Aspirate, it draws the tone in the Perfect to its own syllable⁽²⁾, thus: **ሣቀየ** *šāqaya*; but **ላሐወ** *lāhāwa*. The Imperfect [or Indicative] in this Stem is not distinguished from the Subjunctive, because the means employed for this purpose in other forms (§ 91) are not sufficient to produce a special form in this case. The forms concerned therefore run thus: Perf. **ባረከ**, Imperf. and Subj. **ይባርክ**, Imper. **ባርክ**; in the same way: **ቋፀረ**, **ይቋፅር**, **ቋፅር**; with final Aspirate: **ባልሐ** "to rescue" *bāleha*,

(1) According to PRÆTORIUS, 'Beitr. z. Ass.' I, p. 27, this *yefēsem* must have arisen out of an original *yefišsim* by a compensatory process of lengthening,—to which the Tigrīna **ይፍጽም** [with an audible doubling of the **ጸ**] points. [For another explanation of this form, derived from an analogous phenomenon in Assyrian, v. BEZOLD, 'Zeitschr. f. Assyr.' XVII, p. 273.]

(2) LUDOLF, 'Gr. Aeth.' I, 7, 3.

ይባልሕ, ባልሕ; and from weak roots: **ሳረረ, ይሳርር, ሳርር; ዋሐየ, ይዋሐ, ዋሐ; ሣቀየ, ይሣቂ, ሣቂ; ላሐወ, ይላሐ, ላሐ.**

§ 96. II. Causative Stems.

II. T. and M
Formation
in
Causative
Stems.

1. *In the Causative of the Simple Ground-Stem*, the second radical has *ä* in the Perfect, and so too has the third, in the 3rd pers. sing. masc.: the first, primarily being without a vowel, is attached, by way of closing the syllable, to the formative prefix of the Stem. This closed (first) syllable takes the Tone; and only when the second radical is an Aspirate (with *ä*), does the Tone fall on the second syllable⁽¹⁾. The Causative is formed in the same way, whether from transitive or intransitive roots, thus: **አምሰለ** *ámsala* “to declare alike”; **አፍቀረ** “to love”; **አክሐደ** *akháda* “to convict of falsehood”. From roots with final Aspirate come:—**አንሥኦ** *ánšē’a* “to raise”; **አብርሀ** “to illuminate”. Of all the strong and Aspirate roots, **ብሀለ** alone has the singular peculiarity of parting with its Aspirate (§ 47): **አበለ** *abála*, “to cause to say”, for **አብሀለ**. Besides, it must again be recalled here, that roots with an initial Aspirate do not lengthen their Stem-forming **አ** before the mute Aspirate (§ 46), thus: **አሕረመ, አእመረ**, (not **አሕረመ**). Of the remaining roots, the double-lettered and the vowel-ending have a thoroughly strong formation in this 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the Perfect: **አንበበ** “to read”; **አጉየየ** “to put to flight”; **አትለወ** “to cause to follow”; **አስተየ** “to give to drink”; **አርአየ** “to show”. Specially to be emphasised is **አምዕዐ** *ámé’a* “to provoke”. The Vowel-beginning roots blend their first radical with **አ** into a diphthong: **አውለደ** *áulada* “to deliver” (in birth); **አውሥኦ** “to answer”; **አይበሰ** “to dry up” (*trans.*); **አይድዐ** “to make known”. The Vowel-centred (*med. voc.*) Roots for the most part, even in this Stem, do not admit the *a* after the second radical, and they maintain the shorter pronunciation of I, 1, thereby isolating the **አ** of the Causative Stem, while the tone falls on the long radical vowel, thus: **ሐረ, አሐረ** *ahōra*; **ሮጸ, አሮጸ**; **ሔሰ, አሔሰ** (along with which, to be sure, **አሕየሰ** occurs); **ኬደ, አኬደ**. It is only those which are at the same time Vowel-ending roots, that must of necessity, by § 69, assume the strong formation, just as in I, 1: **አሕየወ** “to enliven”, “to vivify”; **አርወየ** “to give to drink”;

⁽¹⁾ [TRUMPP, p. 522, makes the Tone in these Stems fall on the second syllable throughout, *e. g.* *afqára*. TR.]

አድወየ, አጥወየ. And yet there are a few roots *mediae ū*, which also admit of the strong formation: **የረ** “to be blind” and **የቀ** “to attend to” may indeed form **አየረ** and **አየቀ**, but, when broken up because of the Aspirate, they may also form **አዕወረ** (and **አዐረ**), and **አዕወቀ**. From roots unused in St. I, 1 LUDOLF brings up **አሥወጠ** “to convey back” and **አንወረ** “to insult”, though without supporting-instances. A few roots *mediae ū*, especially those which end in an Aspirate or Labial-Nasal, exhibit quite a peculiar formation,—shortening their *ō* into *ǎ* (originally *ā*) and thus assuming the appearance of simple trilateral Stems⁽¹⁾: **ቦአ** “to come”, **ኖኅ** “to be long”, and the obsolete root **ቦሐ** constantly form **አብአ**, **አንኅ**, **አብሐ** “to permit” (in accordance with § 45), for **አበአ**, **አነኅ**,—which still occurs: Josh. 24, 29 v. Notes [and *Kebra Nag.* 145 a 17]—and **አበሐ**; and they are imitated by (§ 48, *ad fin.*) **ጠቀ**, **አጠቀ** “to confine” Josh. 19, 47, though we have also **አጥወቀ**, Hen. 89, 15⁽²⁾. In the same way **ቆመ** “to rise up”, **ኖመ** “to sleep”—form **አቀመ** and **አነመ**, *e. g.* Judges 16, 14, 19, for which the later manuscripts have **አኖመ**; *cf.* also **አመተ** = **አሞተ**, **አምአ** and **አሞአ**, **አረጹ** = **አርጹ** 2 Esr. 2, 30 *var.* On **አሠጠ** (for **አሥወጠ** or **አሦጠ**) v. the Imperative (*infra*).

In the Subj. and Impf. of this and the other Causative Stems, the Personal formative-prefix **ይ** blends with the Causative **አ** into **ያ**, § 47⁽³⁾; but the **አ** appears again in the Imperative, when the Personal prefix has been thrown off. As regards the vowels, *ě* appears in the Subj. after the second radical, in accordance with § 91, while the first radical is mute, just as in the Perfect, and becomes attached as a closing letter to the prefix-syllable, thus:—**ያፍቅር** *yǎfqer*, **ያብቅላ** *yǎbquel* (from **አብቂላ**); from Aspirate roots:—**ያአምር** *yǎ’mer*, **ያምሕር** *yǎmher*, **ያንሥኡ**, **ያብርህ**; but

(¹) KÖNIG, p. 116. Perhaps at one time the first radical was pronounced as a double letter, to make up for the *ū* that had fallen out,—so that these forms would answer to the Hebrew in **יִנְיָ**, **יִנְיָהּ**.

(²) [FLEMMING, ‘*Das Buch Henoch*’, Leipzig 1902, in this passage adopts the reading **ወአጠቅዎሙ** instead of the reading which DILLMANN selected, **ወአጥወቅዎሙ**. TR.]

(³) According to PRAETORIUS, as cited p. 41 the Tigrīña **የቅተላ** = **ክቅጥ**, **የቅጥ** has preserved the more original forms in preference to the Ethiopic and Amharic ones. [Farther v. *supra*, p. 92, Note (²), as to the frequent use of **አ** instead of the **አ** (resulting from **አአ**) of the 1st pers. Sing. Imperf. Causative. PRAETORIUS draws attention emphatically to this usage (*‘Aeth. Gr.’* p. 51). TR.]

from **አበለ**, **ያብል**;—from double-lettered roots, **ያንብብ**, **ያእትት**; from **አምዕዕ**, **ያምዕዕ** *yām'é*;—from vowel-beginning roots, **ያይድዕ** *yáide'*, *e. g.* Hen. 106, 12, **ያውልድ** *yáwled*⁽¹⁾, **ያውድቅ**, **ያውሕዝ**. In accordance with these we have the Imperative **አፍቅር** *áfqer*, **አአምር**, **አንሥኡ**, **አንብብ**, **አይድዕ**, **አውልድ** *áwled*. Vowel-centred and vowel-ending roots do not admit the *é* after the second radical, thus:—**ያቢት**, Imper. **አቢት**, from **አቤተ**; **ያጹር**, **ያዑድ**; Imper. **አጹር**; so too **አጢስ**, Tobit 6, 16. But those Stems *mediae ū*, which have in the Perfect the short pronunciation **አብአ**, **አቀመ**, form the Subj. usually after that type, **ያብኡ**, **ያቅም**, **ያንም**, **ያብሕ** (Josh. 10, 19)⁽²⁾, and therefore the Imper. **አቅም** (*e. g.* Josh. 6, 3; Judges 20, 7), **አብኡ** *áb'e* (for *á-be'*, § 43), **አንኅ**⁽³⁾. But it should be noticed, as regards the longer or the shorter pronunciation, that the Perfects and the Subjunctives and Imperatives do not always conform to each other by any means, seeing that *e. g.* **አቀመ** may take the form **አቁም** in the Imper. (Liturg.), as well as **አቅም**, and that **አንኅ** may also take the form **ያኑኅ** in the Subj. In like manner **አየቀ** or **አዕወቀ** may form **ያዕቅ** or **ያዕውቅ**, and **አሥወጠ** (?) may have the Imper. **አሥጥ** Deut 22, 1. Vowel-ending roots give: **ያድሉ** *yádlū*, **ያብቁ**, **ያዕዱ**; **ያስቲ**, **ያዕቢ**, **ያርኢ**; Imper. **አድሉ** *ádlū*, **አብቁ**, **አኅሩ**; **አስቲ**, **አርኢ**. Doubly weak roots yield: **ያርዊ**, Imper. **አርዊ**; **ያሕዩ**, Imper. **አሕዩ**; **ያውሒ**, Imper. **አውሒ**. From these forms the *Imperfect* [or *Indicative*] is quite simply fashioned by inserting the accented vowel *a* after the first radical, except that in roots having a middle Aspirate, *é* appears instead, thus: **ያፈቅር** *yāfáqer*, **ያአምር**, **ያነሥኡ**; but **ያምሕር** *yāméher* (kept, by pronunciation, quite distinct from the Subj. **ያምሕር** *yāmher*), **ያብል** *yābel*, **ያነብብ**, **ያምዕዕ** *yā-mé-é'*, **ያየድዕ**, **ያወልድ**, but **ያውሕዝ** *yāwéhez* (overagainst Subj. *yāwhēz*). The Imperfect is formed in a similar manner from all vowel-centred roots, whether they have the long or the short pronunciation in the Subj.: **ያሐውር**, **ያበውኡ**, **ያበውሕ**, **ያነውም**, **ያዐውቅ**, **ያቀውም**, **ያጠውቅ** (Josh. 19, 47), **ያበይት**, **ያከይድ** (properly *yākáyed*, then readily *yākáid*); and from vowel-ending roots:—**ያተሉ**, **ያኅቱ**, **ያደሉ**; **ያስቲ**, but **ያርኢ** (*yāre-'i*, *i. e.* *yār-'i*), **ያረዊ**, **ያወቁ**, **ያውሒ** *yāwe'i*.

(1) According to TRUMPF, p. 529,—to be pronounced *yáwled*.

(2) Also **ያጥቅ**, Lev. 25, 46.

(3) Cf. PHILIPPI, 'Beitr. z. Ass.', II, p. 380.

2. *The Causative of the Intensive Stem* is distinguished in form from the Ground-Stem 2, merely by the prefixed formative syllable of the Stem, **አ**. The latter is always isolated, as the first radical forms along with the first half of the double letter an unchangeable, closed syllable. The tone⁽¹⁾ is usually on the third-last syllable; and only when the second radical is an Aspirate, is it on the second-last in the Perfect. Accordingly the Perfect is: **አገበረ** *agábbara*, “to compel”; **አለዐለ** *alá’ála*, “to lift up” (Judges 7, 20); **አኩነነ**, “to make a judge”; **አመነነ**, “to render contemptible”; **አጎደለ**, “to strengthen”; **አጠየቀ**, “to assure”; **አሠነዩ**, “to beautify”; **አለበወ**, “to make intelligent”. But from roots with final Aspirate we have forms like **አጸብሐ**, “to cause to pay taxes”; **አጐጉኦ**, “to urge to haste”; **አሠሥዐ**, “to satiate”; **አመልዐ**, “to proceed farther”. Seeing, however, that this Stem is rather lengthy and polysyllabic in the Perfect, many roots,—particularly those of the Middle-Aspirate class (§ 56),—endeavour to replace it by St. II, 1, at least in the Perfect, and occasionally even in the other formations (*cf.* § 97, 2): thus **አልዐለ** is used in the Perfect in preference to **አለዐለ**, *e. g.* in Gen. 7, 17; 18, 2; **አእመረ** always, instead of **አአመረ**; **አትሐተ** always, instead of **አተሐተ**, “to humiliate”, but scarcely **አድመነ**, “to wrap up in clouds”⁽²⁾, for **አደመነ**. **አሂረዩ** frequently occurs in the Perfect instead of **አዐረዩ**, “to equalise”. The *Subjunctive* has the form **ያገብር** *yāgábbber*; **ያኩንን**, **ያጠይቅ**, **ያሠኒ**, **ያለቡ**, and the *Imperative* the form **አገብር** *agábbber*, **አኩንን**, **አጠይቅ**, **አሠኒ**, **አለቡ**. But from Middle-Aspirate roots:—*Subjunctive* **ያልዕል** (properly *yālél’-él*, which closes into *yālél’l*, § 56); *Imper.* **አልዕል** *e. g.* Josh. 8, 18⁽³⁾. The *Imperfect* in all cases uniformly runs thus: **ያጌብር** *yāgēber*; **ያሌዕል**, **ያቴሕት**, **ያኳንን**, **ያጌይል**, **ያሢውን**, **ያሢኒ**, **ያሌቡ** &c. Noticeable on account of its

(¹) LUDOLF, ‘*Gr. Aeth.*’ I, 7. This rule, however, does not agree with the teaching of LUDOLF about the Tone in the case of St. I, 2 and III, 2. *Cf.* also *supra*, p. 150, Note 1. [In fact TRUMPP, p. 522, keeps the Tone throughout on the second-last syllable. TR.]

(²) As LUDOLF has it in his ‘*Lexicon*’ p. 496. Certainly LUDOLF himself has incorrectly contrived the forms **አሥወነ** “to cause to foam”, **አንስሐ** “to lead to repentance”, **አውጠነ** “to cause to begin”; **አጐጉኦ** (*v. supra*), for **አሠወነ**, **አንስሐ**, **አወጠነ**, **አጐጉኦ**. At least the other form of pronunciation has hitherto remained without support.

(³) In like manner **አትሕት** Eph. 5, 21.

fluctuations between II, 1 and 2, is the word **አሥገረ**, “to catch in the net”, “to net”, in respect that, for instance, it forms the Perfect (Matt. 17, 27), and the Subjunctive and Imperative (John 21, 3; 1 Cor. 7, 35; Cant. 2, 18) according to Stem II, 1, but the Imperfect (Mark 1, 16; Luke 5, 10) according to Stem II, 2. Farther **አዖረ** and **አዖቀ** form the Subj. from St. II, 1, but the Imperf. from St. II, 2; and a stricter investigation of the treasures of the language would no doubt furnish instances of similar fluctuations in other roots.

3. *The Causative of the Influencing Stem* is likewise distinguished from its Ground-Stem merely by the Stem formative prefix: —Perf. **አላቀሰ** *alāqasa*⁽¹⁾; Subj. **ያላቅሰ**, John 11, 19; Imper. **አላቅሰ**; Imperf. **ያላቅሰ**, John 11, 31. Weak roots: **ያዋከ**. Subj. and Imperf.—(and from quadriliteral roots, which follow this Stem: **ያጸመ** Mark 5, 35; Luke 8, 49; **ያጣዐ** Acts 17, 16). In middle-Aspirate roots the tone in the Perfect must rest here also on the second-last syllable: **አዋሐደ** *awāḥāda*.

§ 97. III. Reflexive Stems.

The Stem formative prefix **ተ** is in the Perfect placed before the root externally and separately; in the Subjunctive and Imperfect it blends with the Personal formative prefix into the syllable **ይተ** and this **ተ** is, in accordance with § 54, assimilated to a following Sibilant or to a mute dental-lingual. In the tense-formation here the change of vowels (§ 91) is never carried out in St. III, 2 and 3, and but seldom in St. III, 1 (*v. infra*). Farther the distinction between the Imperf. and the Subj. is carried out only in Stem III, 2. In Stem III, 3, it could just as little have made its appearance,—for the reasons given in § 95, 3—, as in Stems I, 3 and II, 3. But even in III, 1, where the Subj. has already *a* after the first radical, the Ethiopic means of forming the Imperfect were insufficient to create a special form. To lengthen the *a* would have transformed the Stem into St. III, 3; the lengthening therefore remained in abeyance, and the Subj. and Imperf. coincide. It might be, of course, that in more ancient times the two forms were at least differentiated by means of the tone, *e. g.* that **ይተገበር** as Subjunctive, was pronounced *yetgabār*, and as Imperfect, *yet-gábar* or *yétgabar*.

III.
T. and M.
Formation
in
Reflexive
Stems.

(¹) Cf. *supra*, however, p. 150, Note 2.

1. In the case of the *Reflexive of the Simple Ground-Stem*, seeing that in the Perfect the first radical is originally vowel-less, we might have expected the form **ተከደነ**, like **አከደነ** in Caus. St. II, 1. This form, however, is no longer met with, with the exception of **ተንሥኦ** “to raise one’s self”, “to rise up”⁽¹⁾: and even this exception became possible only through the form having been derived, not from St. I, 1, but directly from St. II, 1, **አንሥኦ** “to lift up”—, overagainst which the Reflexive-Passive of **ነሥኦ** “to take” is invariably given **ተነሥኦ**⁽²⁾. If it is remembered, that **ተ** itself is merely an abbreviation of **እት** or **አት** (§ 80), and that the oldest form must therefore have been **እትከደነ**, we have the explanation of the circumstance that this **ተ** does not, like the Causative **አ**, combine with the first radical to form one syllable. Out of an original **እትከደነ** the form **ተከደነ** arose through abbreviation. **ተከደነ**, in fact, with the tone upon the chief vowel in the second-last syllable is the first and most obvious form of this Stem in the Perfect. But it has not continued to be the only one. On the contrary, in this Reflexive-Passive Stem, the intransitive or passive vowel *ě* (§ 75 sq.) has very frequently made good its position, in place of the Active vowel *a*, as in **ተገብረ** *tagábra* (for *tagábera*); and thereby a change of vowels between the Perfect on the one hand, and the Imperfect and Subjunctive on the other, has been at the same time secured, inasmuch as the *ä* of the Imperfect and Subjunctive answers to the passive *ě* of the Perfect. But which of the two forms of pronunciation is to be employed in the several roots, cannot be determined by general rules. It was, after all, nothing but the usage of the language⁽³⁾ which decided for the one form or the other. In many roots the two forms are freely exchanged for one another. The fundamental difference between the two may possibly at first have been, that **ተዐቀበ**, for instance, signified “to watch one’s self”, “to take care”, while **ተዐቅበ** meant “to be

(1) I cannot accept the explanation of this word given by KÖNIG, p. 148. —According to NÖLDEKE, GGA 1886, No. 26, p. 1016, **ተንሥኦ** is a denominative, from a Substantive like **ትንሣኦ**.

(2) [For the employment of **ተንሥኦ** instead of **ተነሥኦ** and *vice versa*, v. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 637 sq.].

(3) This, however, has not yet been investigated with sufficient strictness; and many statements made by LUDOLF regarding it, in his Dictionary and his Grammar, stand in need of correction.

watched, or cared for”⁽¹⁾; but in later times this distinction was completely obliterated. However, for brevity’s sake, we shall call the pronunciation with ě, “the passive pronunciation”. Accordingly we have in the strong verb the twofold form of the Perfect: **ተመሰጠ** “to be robbed”; **ተገብረ** “to happen”. From the Middle-Aspirate Verb (§ 45) come, for the most part, forms like **ተገሐሠ** *tagéḥša* “to withdraw”; **ተኢህ** “to be taken prisoner”; **ተከህለ** “to be possible”⁽²⁾; more rarely with *ǎ*, **ተበኣሰ** (= **ተበኣሰ**) “to fight”; from a verb with a final aspirate the form is always **ተመልኦ** “to become full”, **ተሰምዐ** “to be heard”. From double-lettered verbs we have either **ተገሠሠ** “to be sought”; or more frequently, with the passive pronunciation, **ተነበ** “to be read”; **ተሰደ** “to be banished”, in some few instances written **ተሰድደ** (§ 55); but **ተምዕዐ** *tamé’a*, “to be angry”, may, according to § 56, by throwing back the doubling of the second radical upon the first, be simplified into **ተምዐ** *tammé’a*, and then into *tám’a*. Vowel-beginning and vowel-ending verbs always have the strong formation in the Perfect: **ተየደዐ** “to become known”; **ተወልደ** “to be born”; **ተውህበ** “to be given”; **ተዐደወ** “to transgress”; **ተወድየ** “to be put in”; **ተከዕወ** “to be poured out”; **ተርኣየ** “to be seen”. Vowel-centred roots, when uttered with *a*, have the strong formation; if given with ě, they reject the ě (§ 50) and produce a diphthong: **ተሀወከ** Numb. 22, 3 and **ተሀውከ** Matt. 2, 3, “to be troubled”; **ተሀደደ** Hen. 89, 58 “to be robbed”; **ተሠደመ** “to be settled”; very rarely the diphthong blends into a mixed sound: **ተሦዐ** “to be sacrificed” (Org.); **ተቂኣ** (?) “to be disgorged”.—The Subjunctive and Imperfect are formed from the whole body of the roots ‘strongly’, and uniformly with the chief vowel *a* after the second radical, and with *ǎ* as the readiest vowel for the first. Vowel-centred roots must harden their vowel-radical; the vowel-ending ones combine it with the preceding *ǎ* into a diphthong; and it

(1) As LUDOLF assumed. But LUDOLF, trusting too much to this assumed law of his, often enough set up a form in his Dictionary like **ተዐቀበ**, without being able to give an instance of its use, even when he had frequently met with the other form **ተዐቀበ** in the Perfect (v. DRECHSLER, p. 34).

(2) It is not correct in copyists to lengthen the vowel of the first radical before a mute Aspirate, thus: **ተኡሐለ** “to paint one’s eyes”, for **ተኸሐለ**.

is only roots *tertiæ* *ū* which may farther blend the diphthong into a mixed sound (exactly as in the Ground-stem, § 94), thus: **ይትገበር** *yétgabar* ⁽¹⁾, **ይትመሰጥ**, **ይትክኅዝ**, **ይሰግዕ** (§ 46), **ይትኀሠሥ**, **ይትነበብ**, **ይትወሀብ**, **ይትየዳዕ**, **ይትሀየድ**, **ይትሀወክ**, **ይሠዋዕ**, **ይትዐደው** or **ይትዐዶ**, **ይትወደዶ**, **ይትረክዶ**. Also the Perfect **ተንሥኦ** forms the Imperfect and Subjunctive **ይትነሣኦ**, just like **ተነሥኦ**; and in the same way **ተምዕዐ** and **ተምዐ** equally form **ይትመዳዕ**. The Imperative, because derived from the Subj., likewise exhibits *a* invariably after the second radical: **ተገበር**, **ተክኅዝ**, **ተፈታሕ**, **ተሠየም**, **ተፈተው** or **ተፈቶ**, **ተፈደዶ**, **ተረክዶ** &c. But in the Imperative of **ተንሥኦ** the peculiar pronunciation, imitated from Causative 1, comes back again, **ተንሥኦ**, “Arise!”. So too runs the Imperative of **ተምዕዐ**, shortened into **ተምዕ** (Plural also, **ተምዕዐ**). Farther, Middle-Aspirate roots, which have the Passive pronunciation **ተግሕሠ** in the Perf., occasionally take the shorter form **ተግሐሥ**, *tag^eháš*, Numb. 16, 21, 26; 17, 10, instead of the regular **ተግሐሥ**; (in MS. F this shorter form occurs in the passages named, whereas the other MSS. have **ተግሐሥ**, a reading which is also met with in Ps. 33, 15 and 36, 28) ⁽²⁾.

2. *The Reflexive of the Intensive Stem*, according to LUDOLF, must in the Perfect have the tone upon the vowel of the second radical; in the other forms it rests upon the vowel of the first. The Perf. has the strong formation in all roots: **ተቀደሰ** *tagaddása*, “to be sanctified”; **ተከነነ** *takuannána*, “to be condemned”; **ተወሰከ** “to be added to”; **ተሰፈወ** “to hope”; **ተዐረየ** “to become equal to one another”; **ተዐወረ** *ta'awwára*, “to overlook”; **ተዐየረ** “to reprove”. But from roots with final Aspirate, regularly:—**ተፈሥከ** “to rejoice”; **ተመልከ** “to be salted”; **ተየውሀ** “to let one's self be pacified”. Farther, as the Aspirates, following the later pronunciation, readily grew too nerveless for doubling (§ 56), a phenomenon made its appearance, which became noticeable also in Stem II, 2 (§ 96), viz.—that in the Perfect Middle-Aspirate roots fell back from Stem III, 2 to Stem III, 1. Thus **ተመሀረ** *tamahhára* first of all becomes *tamahhera*, seeing that a Passive *é*

(1) According to TRUMPF, p. 527, to be accented *yetgábar*.

(2) **ተንበቢ** in the Ethiopic Liturgy (ed. BEZOLD, in SWAINSON'S ‘Greek Liturgies’, London 1884), p. 384, l. 11—is probably a copyist's error for **ተናበቢ**.

is at least possible instead of *a* (v. *supra* in this § 97), and then *tamehhera* (by § 45), which ultimately drops into *taméhra*. And so we have **ተመሀረ** and **ተምሀረ** “to learn”; **ተተሐተ** and **ተትሕተ** “to be made humble”; **ተለዐለ** and **ተልዕለ** “to be exalted”; **ተዘሀረ** and **ተዝሀረ** “to be vainglorious”; **ተደኅረ** (e. g. Judges 5, 28 F) and **ተደኅረ** “to remain behind”, “to loiter”; **ተጽዕነ** “to mount upon”; **ተስክለ** “to enquire about”; **ተጸዐረ** and **ተጽዕረ** “to be tormented”; **ተጸክለ** and **ተጽክለ** “to be reviled”; **ተየሀደ** and **ተይሀደ** “to become a Jew”. In the Subj. and Imperative, both these and all other roots have *a* after the second radical as chief vowel, and also *a* after the first. In the Imperfect they have *ē* after the first radical, and dispense with the doubling of the second, thus: **ይትፄደስ**, **ይትቀደስ**, **ተቀደስ** *yetqēdas*, *yetqāddas*, *tagāddas*; **ይትሌዐል**, **ይትለዐል**, **ተለዐል**; **ይትፈሳሕ**, **ይትፈሳሕ**, **ተፈሳሕ**; **ይትዩዋህ**, **ይትየዋህ**, **ተየዋህ**; **ይትዒወር**, **ይትዐወር**, **ተዐወር**; **ይሴፎ** or **ይሴፈው**, **ይሰፎ**, **ተሰፎ** or **ተሰፈው**; **ይትዒረይ**, **ይትዐረይ**, **ተዐረይ** &c.

3. *The Reciprocity-Stem* takes the form in the Perfect **ተፋለጠ** “to separate from one another”, with the tone upon *ā*, *tafālata*⁽¹⁾, but in Middle-Aspirate verbs, with the tone upon the penult, **ተሳህለ** “to be propitious towards any one”, *tašāhāla*. From roots with final Aspirate the form has always *ē* (in place of *a*) after the second radical: **ተጋበክ** *tagābe’a*, and more shortly *tagāb’a*. In all weak roots this Stem takes a full and strong formation: **ተፃረረ** “to be foes to each other”; **ተግዕዐ** *tamā’ē’a* and *tamā’a* “to be angry at one another”; **ተያውሀ** “to flatter one another”; **ተዋሰበ** “to intermarry”; **ተዋሥከ** “to conduct a learned controversy”; **ተራወጸ** “to run together”; **ተካዩደ** “to enter into a confederacy”; **ተዋነዩ** “to play together”; **ተፋነወ** “to take leave of one another”. Farther, in the Subj., Imper. and Imperf. this Stem has *a* after the second radical, while there is no distinction between the Subj. and Imperf., thus:—**ይትፋለጥ**, **ይትጋበክ**, **ይፃረር**, **ይትዋሰብ**, **ይትራወጽ**, **ይትዋነይ**; **ተፋለጥ**, **ተጋበክ** &c.

§ 98. IV. The Causative-Reflexive Stems, as active verbs, have the active vowel *a* in the Perfect after the second radical, and, like the other Active Stems, change it into *ē* in the Imperfect and Subjunctive. The formative prefix of the Stem **አስተ**, when combined with the personal prefix, becomes **ያስተ** (§ 47).

IV.T. and M.
Formation
in
Causative-
Reflexive
Stems.

(1) Cf., however, *supra*, p. 155, Note (1).

1. The *first* of these Stems has two forms of pronunciation in the Perfect. In the form which is most obvious and usual the first radical, originally without a vowel, is attached to the formative prefix **ተ** by way of closing the syllable (exactly as in II, 1)⁽¹⁾, thus: **አስተንፈሰ** “to inhale”; with final Aspirate, **አስተግብአ** “to take (by force of arms)” Numb. 21, 32; **አስተብጽዐ** “to pronounce blessed”; and **አስተብቀዐ** “to make intercession”; from weak roots:— **አስተውሐሰ** “to borrow” (Ex. 12, 35); **አስተርአዩ** “to appear” and “to reveal”; **አስተስረዩ** “to obtain forgiveness”; from roots with initial Aspirate:—**አስተሐቀረ** “to treat contemptuously” (Gen. 29, 25; Judges 16, 10). The tone in these cases rests on the third-last syllable⁽²⁾, and in Middle-Aspirate roots on the second-last. But, alongside of this,—the usual pronunciation,—another has also become current, which puts forward the prefix **አስተ** in a separate fashion, after the manner of the Reflexive Stems, and causes an *ä* to be heard after the first radical. In this case the tone must undoubtedly rest on the second-last syllable; cf. TRUMPP, p. 524. This form of expression appears oftenest in roots *tertiæ gutturalis*, e. g. **አስተቀንአ** “to be envious”; **አስተበውሐ** “to ask permission”, and in roots *primæ gutturalis*⁽³⁾, e. g. **አስተአበደ** “to treat as a fool”; **አስተአከዩ** “to declare bad”; **አስተኀሠሠ** “to invent”; and here and there too in other roots, e. g. in **አስተረሐቀ**, a collateral form of **አስተርሐቀ** “to remove”. It is noteworthy besides, that from the unused root **በውሐ**, which assumes the short form **አብሐ** in St. II, 1 (§ 96), **አስተብሐ** also is formed in this Stem, as well as **አስተበውሐ** “to ask permission”. But the difference between these two forms of pronunciation is of no importance in the formation of the other tenses and moods. In the Subjunctive the first radical is always attached without a vowel to the formative prefix **ተ** by way of closing the syllable:—**ያስተንፍስ**, **ያስተብቀው**, **ያስተርክብ**, **ያስተሐቅር**, **ያስተስራ**, **ያስተርኢ**; and accordingly in the Imperative we have **አስተርክብ**, **አስተብቀው**, **አስተምሕር**, **አስተስራ**, **አስተርኢ**. In the formation of the Imperfect, *ä* (probably also accented here) is inserted after the first radical: **ያስተረክብ**,

(1) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 148.

(2) V. on the other hand TRUMPP, p. 523.

(3) To avoid lengthening the *a* of **ተ**,—for which reason one says **አስተሐቀረ** as well as **አስተሐቀረ**.

ያስተበቀላል, **ያስተገሥሥ**, **ያስተሰሪ**; in Middle-Aspirate verbs, *á* is thickened into *é*: **ያስተምሕር** *yāstaméher* (overagainst which we have the Subjunctive *yāstamher*); **ያስተብል**, **ያስተርኢ** (*yāstaré'ī*, and therefore in some Manuscripts occasionally written **ያስተራኢ**⁽¹⁾, v. St. I, 1).

2. The *Stem*, of this class, derived from the second Ground-*Stem* takes the form in the Perfect, **አስተዐገሠ**, with the accent on the third-last syllable⁽²⁾ (v. St. II, 2), thus:—*asta'ággaša*, “to practise patience”. It takes the strong formation in all weak roots, *e. g.*—**አስተዐበዩ** “to brag”, “to swagger”; **አስተሰፈወ** “to awaken hope in any one”; **አስተገዩሰ** “to prefer”; **አስተወከለ** “to have complete trust”; and in roots *tertiæ gutturalis*: **አስተፈሥሐ** “to rejoice” (*astafáššeḥa*). In the Subjunctive the *á* after the first radical is of course maintained, and the *a* after the second becomes *e*: **ያስተዐገሥ** *yāsta'ággeš*; **ያስተገዩሰ**, **ያስተወከል**, **ያስተዐቢ**, **ያስተሰፋ**, **ያስተፈሥሕ**⁽³⁾; so too with the Imperative:—**አስተዐግሥ** &c. The Imperfect is formed (as in all the Intensive Stems) by means of *ē* after the first radical, while the doubling is given up: **ያስተዔገሥ**, **ያስተፈሥሕ**, **ያስተዔቢ**, **ያስተሒፋ** &c.

3. The *Stem*, of this class, derived from the third Ground-*Stem* forms the Perfect **አስተማሰለ**, with the accent on the third-last syllable⁽⁴⁾; from roots *tertiæ gutturalis*: **አስተጋብአ**; in like manner **አስተማዕዐ**. For other examples v. *supra* § 84. The Subjunctive and Imperfect are not distinguished from each other; in both *e* appears instead of *a* after the second radical:—**ያስተማሰል** *yāstamāsel*, **ያስተጋብአ**, **ያስተፃርር**, **ያስተባሪ**, **ያስተሓዩ**, **ያስተማዕዕ**; and, accordingly in the Imperative: **አስተማሰል**, **አስተባሪ** &c.

§ 99. The *Multiliteral Verb* follows, generally, the same rules as the Triliteral in forming the Tenses and Moods. In the Multiliteral verb also, the inner vowel-change between the two tenses invariably makes its appearance with the second-last radical. The first two radicals are combined into one syllable, with *a* between them, and they are maintained in this combination, throughout nearly the whole of the farther development of the form: in

Tense and
Mood For-
mation of
Multiliteral
Verbs:—

(1) Also **ያስተራኢ**, Herm. p. 85 a, l. 3; cf. KÖNIG, p. 119.

(2) In Middle-Aspirate verbs, on the penult. V. however TRUMPP, p. 524.

(3) Once however **ያስተጽዕንዎ**; v. DILLMANN'S 'Lex.', col. 1306.

(4) V. however TRUMPP, p. 524.

the Imperfect, however, and in Stems III,3 and IV,3 this group has to be broken up. Farther, in this group the *a*-Sound is held to be so essential, and a long vowel in the first Stem-syllable so reasonable, that this *a* is not thickened into *e* before a mute Aspirate according to § 45, but is lengthened into *ā* according to § 46. In the domain of the last two radicals, however, the same rules prevail with regard to the treatment of Aspirates, radical Vowels and double radicals, as in the Triliteral verb.

I. In
Ground-
Stem.

I. *The Ground-Stem* does not distinguish between a transitive and an intransitive form of pronunciation in the *Perfect*. It is always uttered with three *a*'s⁽¹⁾, the first syllable either closed, or possessing a long vowel having the Tone⁽²⁾, thus: **ደንገፀ** *dāngasa*, "to be terrified"; with an aspirate as second radical:—**ማሀረክ** *māhraka*, "to take as booty"; with a similar letter as last radical: **ገፍትኦ**, "to destroy"; with an aspirate in the second as well as in the last position: **ባጉብጉ** "to rot"; with doubling of the third radical: **ደምስስ** "to extinguish"; with a like doubling when the radical is at the same time weak: **ጸሕየየ** "to clear of weeds"; with a long vowel as second radical: **ማሰነ** "to decay", **ዴንነ** "to persecute", **ቶስሐ** "to mix"; with a vowel as last radical: **ደርቦየ** "to shoot", **ሰንቀወ** "to touch the harp"; weak in more than one radical: **ዐውየወ** "to lament aloud", **ዒወወ** "to take prisoner", **ጌገየ** "to sin", **ጸነወ** "to give forth perfume", **ለለወ** "to inflame.

The Subjunctive is formed by the prefixed Personal signs and by the transition of the *a* which follows the second last radical into *ē*: **ደደንገፀ** *yedāngeṣ*; *primae gutturalis*: **የዐንገር**; farther examples:—**ይማሀረክ**, **ይገፍትኦ**, **ይባጉብጉ**, **ይደምስስ**, **ይጸሕዩ**, **ይማስን**, **ይዴንን**, **ይቶስሐ**, **ይደርቢ**, **ይሰንቁ**, **የዐውዩ**, **ይዒወ** or **ይዒወው**, **ይጌገ**, **ይጸኑ**, **ይለለ**. In accordance with these forms, we have in the *Imperative*: **ደንገፀ**, **ባጉብጉ**, **ደምስስ**, **ዴንን**, **ዒውው** (Judges 5, 12), &c.⁽³⁾. To form *the Imperfect*, an accented *a* is inserted after the second radical, which brings about the separation into two syllables of the syllable made up of the first two radicals:

(1) [Excepting, of course, the necessary modification of the second *a*, when the last radical is an Aspirate. TR.]

(2) V. however TRUMPF, p. 524.

(3) Irregular are: Subj. **ይምሀረክ** Kuf. p. 122, N. 4; p. 160, N. 11; and Imperative **መሀረክ** Is. 8, 1, 3 *var.*—and **ይጸሐዩ** from **ጸሐየየ**.

ይደነግፅ *yedanáges*, **ይመሀርክ**, **ይገፈትኦ**, **ይብጐብጐ**, **ይደመስስ**, **ይሰነቁ** (Rev. 14, 2), **ይደረቢ**, **የዐወዩ**. But those roots which have a long vowel as second radical, like **ማሰነ**, **ዴነነ**, **ቶስሐ**, can have no special form for the Imperfect, because an *a* inserted after that radical blends with such long vowel; and even roots like **ንገዩ**, **ሉለወ** are too sluggish to break up their mixed sound; thus we have: **ይማስን**, **ይደግን**, **ይቶስሐ**, **ይንጊ**, **ይሉሉ** (Jas. 3, 6), **ይዲወ** (which do not differ from the Subjunctive forms, v. *supra*). Seldom is it,—and it is not good Ethiopic,—that roots which have a vowel for their final radical omit the proper formation of the Imperfect, as, for instance, in the citation by LUDOLF from a manuscript of the *Organon*: **እንተ፡ ኢትመጽሉ** “which does not wither”, instead of **ትመጽሉ**.

II. In exact conformity with the same rules are also formed the tenses and moods of the *Causative Stem* of Quadriliteral roots. *Perfect*: **አመንደብ** *amándaba* ⁽¹⁾ “to bring into difficulty”; **አማኅፀነ** “to entrust to”; **አቀምጥዐ** “to put the ground in good order”; **አጠእጥአ** “to prepare”; **አመርሰሰ** “to cause to feel after”; **አሰርገወ** “to adorn”; **አጐንደዩ** “to delay one”; **አንገዩ** “to cause to sin”; **አጼነወ** “to smell at”; **አጸመወ** “to cause trouble”; **አርጎርጎ** ⁽²⁾ “to appease”; **አጸንሕሐ** “to sacrifice”. *Subjunctive*: **ያመንድብ**, **ያማኅፀን**, **ያቀምጥዕ**, **ያጠእጥኦ**, **ያመርስስ**, **ያሰርጉ**, **ያጐንዲ**, **ያንጊ**, **ያጼኑ**, **ያጸሙ**, **ያራጎርጎ**, **ያጸንሕሕ**, or **ያጽነሐንሕ**; *Imperative*: **አመንድብ**, **አማኅፀን** &c.; *Imperfect*: **ያመነድብ**, **ያመኅፀን**, **ያቀመጥዕ**, **ያጠእጥኦ**, **ያመረስስ**, **ያሰረጉ**, **ያጐነዲ**, but **ያንጊ**, **ያጼኑ**, **ያጸሙ**. Quinqueliteral roots combine in one syllable the first radical and the formative prefix of the Stem, and the second and third in one, with *a*: the second-last radical supports the vowel-change. In the Imperfect formation *a* establishes itself after the third radical, and the syllable formed by the second and third is thus resolved into two syllables. Thus: **አርመስመሰ** *armásmasa*, “to feel about”; **አቅያሕይሐ** and **አቅዩሐይሐ** “to become reddish”; **አንጠብጠብ** “to drip”; **አምዐርዐረ** “to sweeten”:—*Subjunctive*: **ያርመስምስ**, **ያቅያሕይሕ**, **ያማዕርር**;—*Imperfect*: **ያርመሰምስ** *yārmásámes*, **ያቅዩሐይሕ** (Lev. 13, 24; Matt. 16, 2, 3), **ያንጠብጥብ**, Ps. 71, 6. In the same way **አጸምሀዩዩ**, **አጽመሀዩዩ**, **አጽማሀዩዩ**, or **አጸማሀዩዩ** “to render flabby”; **አልጥሰሰ**

II. In
Causative
Stem.

(1) V. however TRUMPF, p. 524.

(2) [A peculiar form for **አራጎርጎ**, v. DILLMANN'S '*Lex.*' TR.]

“to whisper gently”, and the two Causatives, formed by **አስ**, § 85 *ad fin.*; except that here the Subjunctive and Imperfect cannot be distinguished: **ያልጥስስ**, **ያስቆርር**, **ያስፃዝዝ**, also **ያስቆቁ**.

III. T. and M.
Formation
in
Reflexive
Stems of
Multiliteral
Verbs.

§ 100. III. In the *Reflexive Stem* the second-last radical exhibits no vowel-change between the two tenses, § 97; but, on the other hand, it has become possible in this case to make a difference between the Imperfect and the Subjunctive by inserting, in the former, *a* after the second radical, which is without a vowel in the Subjunctive; and it is only in roots *mediae infirmae* that the Imperf. and the Subj. coincide (just as in Stems I and II). Thus we have in the *Perfect*: **ተመንደበ** *tamándaba* ⁽¹⁾; **ተደምሰሰ**, “to be extinguished”; **ተማኅፀነ**, **ተገፍትኦ**, **ተጸእጸኦ**, “to worship”; **ተመንሰወ** “to be tempted”; **ተጸምሀዩ**, **ተማሰነ**, **ተሞጥሐ**, **ተሴሰዩ**, **ተቤዘወ** (§ 86):—*Subjunctive*: **ይትመንደብ**, **ይደምሰስ** (Ps. 108, 13), **ይትማኅፀን** (Ps. 120, 7), **ይትገፍታኦ**, **ይጸእጸኦ**, **ይትመንሰው**, **ይጸምሀዩ**, **ይትማሰን**, **ይትሞጣሐ**, **ይሴሰዩ**, **ይትቤዘው**: *Imperative*: **ተደምሰስ**, **ተማኅፀን** &c. But in the Imperfect we have:—**ይትመንደብ** *yetmanádab*, **ይደመሰስ**, **ይትመኅፀን**, **ይትገፈታኦ**, **ይጸኦጸኦ**, **ይትመነሰው**, **ይጸመሀዩ**; but **ይትማሰን** &c. just as in the Subj. The Reflexive Stem of Sexliterate roots has hitherto been found in the Perfect only. On the formation of the Perfect of the *Reciprocal Stem*, v. § 86. It deserves special notice, that even the root **ዜነወ** resolves the *ē*, which it preserves through all the forms of Stems I and III,—into *ay*, before the inserted *ā*. Of course the Tone falls upon the long *ā*, to which this Stem owes its form. There is no difference between the *Imperfect* and the *Subjunctive* (*cf.* §§ 95—97), nor is there any change of vowels in the two Tense-formations. Thus:—**ይሰናሰል**, Ex. 26, 3; **ይጠናቀቅ**, Lev. 23, 22; **ይደናጸው**, **ይሰናከው**, **ይሰከተዩ**; *Imperative*: **ተሰናከው**, **ተዘያነው** &c.

IV. In
Causative-
Reflexive
Stems.

IV. The *Causative-Reflexive Stem* is, in accordance with § 86, of very rare occurrence. In the Imperf. and Subj. it necessarily exhibits the vowel-change found in all the Active Stems, hence **ያስተሰናኩ**, Jas. 3, 17.

V. In
Second
Reflexive
Stem.

V. The *weaker Reflexive Stem*, which is formed by prefixing **አን** (§ 87), so far shows its kinship with the Active Stems, as to exhibit the usual difference of vocalisation prevailing in those Stems between the two Tense-forms. The Imperfect is distinguished from

(1) But *cf.* TRUMPF. 524.

the Subjunctive just as in the other Stems of the Multiliteral roots. The Personal sign in the Subj. and Imperf. is connected with **ኣ** just as it is in other cases with **ኣሰ** and **ኣ**. Whence we have, in the *Perfect*: **ኣንጉርጉረ** *anguárguara*⁽¹⁾; in the *Subjunctive*: **ያንጉርጉር**; in the *Imperative*: **ኣንጉርጉር**; and in the *Imperfect*: **ያንጉረጉር**. With Aspirates and Radical vowels; *Perfect*: **ኣንባሕብሐ**, **ኣንቃዕደወ**, **ኣንጦልዐ**, **ኣንሶሰወ**, **ኣንጌገዩ**; *Subjunctive*: **ያንባሕብሐ**, **ያንቃዕዱ**, **ያንጦልዕ**, **ያንሶሱ**, **ያንጌጊ**; *Imperfect*: **ያንበሐብሐ**, **ያንቀዕዱ**, and the rest just as in the Subjunctive⁽²⁾.

III. FORMATION OF PERSONS, GENDERS AND NUMBERS.

§ 101. It belongs to the very conception of a verb, as distinguished from a mere predicate, that it not only gives what is predicated, but also,—contained within it or at least indicated by it,—the Person, of whom anything is predicated. Accordingly the Verb furnishes its Tense- and Mood-Stems with Personal signs, as the third step which it takes towards its full development. In order to manage this step, it encroaches upon the domain of the Pronouns, inasmuch as it is just the Personal pronouns which are made use of to express the several Persons. The Personal signs have originated in the combination of the personal pronouns with the verbal Stem. The former in due course coalesced with the latter, but in this closer connection they have undergone abbreviation and occasionally considerable mutilation. The entire apparatus of the distinction of the Persons in Gender and Number, which prevails and lives in the language, in the domain of the Personal Pronouns, is thus reproduced in the Verb. And just as, in accordance with § 148, two Numbers, the Singular and the Plural, are distinguished in the Personal Pronoun, and two Genders, Masculine and Feminine, in the two pronouns of the second and third Person, so are these distinctions repeated in the verb in Ethiopic.

Formation of Persons, Genders and Numbers :—
General Remarks.

It has already been pointed out in § 91, that the position which is assumed by the Personal sign with respect to the Verbal

(1) But v. TRUMPP, p. 525.

(2) On the peculiar forms of **ኣንሳሕሰሐ** "to move (*intr.*)" v. DILLMANN'S 'Lex.', col. 327. On the Passive-Reflexives formed with **ተ**, like **ተንጦልዐ**, v. *supra*, p. 165.

Stem, is of essential importance in the formation of the two contrasted Tenses. In the Perfect the Personal signs are attached to the end of the Stem; in the Imperfect and Subjunctive, to the beginning. This different method of attachment, however, has caused the modification of the originally complete pronoun to have another character in the Perfect than it has in the Imperfect; and accordingly the Personal signs actually in use in the language fall into two divisions.

Personal
Signs of
the Perfect.

1. *The Personal signs of the Perfect*⁽¹⁾. The *Third Person Sing. Masc.* is not distinguished by any special sign. Seeing that all the other persons and genders in both numbers were denoted exactly by terminations, the Personal sign could be dispensed with in this one case, by virtue of the contrast. The *Third Person Sing. Fem.*, on the other hand, has *at*, which serves the same purpose also in Nominal Stems, v. § 126. The *Third Person Plural Masc.* is denoted by *û*, and the *Third Person Plural Fem.* by *â*. The former is shortened⁽²⁾ from *ûmû*, *ûm*, *ûn*, the latter from *ôn* (ወ-አቶ?), *ân*.—The sign for the *Second Person Sing.* is in the *Masc.* **h**, in the *Fem.* **ḥ**. The vowel-change between the two genders is the very same as in the full pronoun of the second person (§ 148): the other Semitic languages also retain this change, either complete or in traces. **h** or **ḥ** itself, however, is nothing else than the second element of the full compound Pronoun **ḥṭ** or **ḥṭṭ** (§ 148), inasmuch as (v. § 65), from the original *twa*, from which **ṭ** sprung, **h** might also come, and has come not only in this case, but also in the Suffix Pronoun of the Second Person in both Numbers in all Semitic languages⁽³⁾. In the Plural also, Ethiopic transforms the original sound into *k* in the same way: *Masc.* **ḥṃ** *kémmû*; *Fem.* **ḥṭ** *kén*, answering completely to the second

(1) Cf. now with this, in particular, NÖLDEKE, '*Untersuchungen zur semitischen Grammatik*', ZDMG XXXVIII, p. 407 sqq., [reprinted with numerous additions in '*Beitr. z. sem. Sprachwiss.*', Strassburg 1904:—where v. p. 15 sqq.]

(2) As is still more clearly seen in the other Semitic languages.

(3) The difference between Ethiopic and the other Semitic languages is merely this, that the latter put into the difference of the types *ta* and *ka*, the contrast between the pronoun used as Subject and the pronoun used in a subordinate position, while the former—the Ethiopic language—employed the type *ta* for the separate pronoun, and the type *ka* for the pronoun when suffixed.

element in **አንተሙ**, **አንትን**, § 148.—For the *First Person* the sign in the Sing. is **ከ**, in the Plural **ኑ**. The *k* in *ku*, it would appear, is more original than the *t*, which all the other Semitic tongues exhibit (§ 65); and certainly the influence of the Personal sign of the second person has had the effect of making this *k* retain its position here more tenaciously⁽¹⁾. But all the more was the vowel *ū*,—which comes just as readily to hand as *ī* (§ 65),—bound to establish itself for the First Person, lest the First Person and the Second Person Fem. should be confounded together. The **ኑ** of the Plural is a remnant of the full Pronoun **ኑህኑ**, § 148.

2. For the *Imperfect* [or *Indicative*] and the *Subjunctive* the Personal signs have to be set before the Theme, in accordance with the original meaning of the grammatical form. But as the signs of the Verbal Stems are also set as prefixes, the Personal signs had to be compressed into the utmost possible brevity, to keep the several verbal forms from being overloaded in their commencement. In Ethiopic, therefore, just as in the other Semitic tongues, the prefixed Personal signs are either very short from the outset, or have been much abbreviated, and consist of one single comparatively strong letter. But as such a letter sufficed merely to denote the different Persons, but not the Genders or Numbers, the needful assistance was obtained from signs of Gender and Number attached farther to the close of the form.—The *Third Person*, first of all in the Sing., has in the beginning of the form **ደ** for the Masculine, and **ት** for the Feminine, and no farther marking in either case at the end of the Theme. The **ት** is assuredly the same mark of the Feminine which appears in the Perfect, and very generally besides in the domain of Nominal Stems (§ 126). But, in the same way, **ደ** is nothing else than the original Pronoun of the Third Person (§ 65), and first denotes merely the Third Person, as contrasted with the other personal signs **ኑ**, **ኢ**, **ኣ**, with-

Personal
Signs of
the Imper-
fect—[Indi-
cative and
Subjunc-
tive].

(¹) While the *t* of the Second Persons in the other tongues brought about the transition from *k* to *t* in the First.—ERMAN, ZÄS XXVII, p. 81, points out the *ku* of the 1st pers. sing. Perf. in Egyptian also. Cf. farther HALÉVY, 'Notes sémitiques' in the 'Mélanges Renier' (Paris 1886), p. 447 sqq. On **ሀ** instead of **ሀ** of the 1st pers. Sing. in Southern Arabia cf. v. MALTZAN, ZDMG XXV, p. 197, and MORDTMANN, *ibid.* XLIV, p. 191.

out distinction of gender (and so in the⁽¹⁾ Plur.). It is only as contrasted with the Feminine **ት**, that it receives a Masculine signification⁽²⁾. In the Plural there are appended, besides, *ū* for the Masc., and *ā* for the Fem., plainly the same signs of the Plural which are found in the Perfect; and in fact they always yield the mere sounds of *ū* and *ā* in Ethiopic, while, as is well known, the other tongues have continued to preserve, precisely in the Imperfect, their more original and complete form. Seeing that *ā*, by its difference from *ū*, of itself denotes the Fem., the change from **ይ** to **ት** in the prefixed Personal sign is omitted in the Plural; **ይ** suffices for both genders, as being the general expression for the Third Person. To denote the *Second Person*, the sign **ት** is prefixed in the Singular and Plural for both genders, that sign being a shortened form of **አንተ**, **አንተሙ** (§ 148). The **ት** thus prefixed has to suffice for the indication of the Masc. Sing.; and the inconvenience of having in this way the 2nd pers. Sing. Masc. undistinguished from the 3rd pers. Sing. Fem., which has the very same form, has not been remedied in any way in Ethiopic. But the Fem. Sing., and the Masc. and Fem. Plural are again specially differentiated by appended signs. For the Fem. Sing. this purpose is served by the vowel *ī*, which also indicates the Feminine gender in the separate pronoun of the 2nd pers. Sing.; and to denote the Plural,—seeing that the *Person* has already been designated by a prefix as the Second,—the general signs of the Plural, used also in the Third Person, are made use of, viz. *ū* for the Masc. and *ā* for the Fem.—The *First Person* has the prefix **አ** in the *Sing.*, being a shortened

(1) In Assyrian, according to HAUPT, the type *yaqtulu* for the Fem. occurs much oftener than *taqtulu*: v. ZDMG XXXIV, p. 757.

(2) This use of *i* for the Third Person without distinction of Gender points back to a time for the formation of the Personal signs, when **ውአ** and **ይአ** were not yet contrasted with each other as Masc. and Fem., any more than this contrast is shown in **ይአሁ** “now”.—That **ይ**, **י**, **יָ** is not merely a modification of *we*, will perhaps now be generally acknowledged (v. DIETRICH, ‘*Abhandl. zur hebr. Gramm.*’, 1846, p. 122 sqq.; EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, p. 434 Note). That Syriac has *ne* instead, still proves nothing for the softening of *ye* out of *ne*, but only that Syriac had in general at a very early stage lost the demonstrative word **ይአ** (as follows from the want of *ī* in the formation of the construct state) and that another demonstrative element came to be used in its place (§ 62).

form of አኀ "I", and the prefix ን in the *Plural*, a shortened form of ንሕኀ "We"; and these two prefixes are severally quite sufficient, as there is no distinction of Genders in the first Person.

§ 102. The attachment of these Personal signs to the Stem of the Tenses and Moods is regulated in part by the vowel character or consonantal character of the first letter of the Personal signs to be appended, and in part by the conditions of accentuation⁽¹⁾.

Attachment
of Personal
Signs in the
Perfect.

1. Three of the Personal signs of the *Perfect* have a vowel commencement, viz: *at*, *ū*, *ā*; the others begin with a consonant. At one time all were certainly accented, but the majority of them have become tone-less. However, *ū*, *ā*, *kémmū*, *kén*, as a rule, keep their accent, and at the same time generally attract the tone of the word, since the actual word can have only one principal accent. The others have all become tone-less; but those which begin with a consonant, throw their accent no farther back than upon the syllable immediately preceding,—which invariably is either closed, or furnished with a long vowel or a diphthong; and only the vowel-beginning *at*, not forming any closed syllable before it, leaves unchanged throughout in the Perfect Stem the accent possessed by the Stem at first. But even the Personal signs *ū* and *ā*, which usually attract the tone to themselves, give it up to the foregoing syllable, if that syllable has a Stem-long vowel, or an unchangeably long vowel (as in ንሕኀ, ንሕኀ). The nature of the attachment of these Personal signs, for the rest, is very simple. Seeing that the last radical in the Perfect-Stem is originally vowel-less (§ 91), the signs which commence with a consonant are appended to it in such a way that a closed syllable precedes them, while those which begin with a vowel are attached so as to draw the preceding third radical into their syllable. If the third radical is a vowel, the consonantal-commencing signs are simply appended to it as a new syllable; but, before the vowel-commencing ones, the vowel of the Stem must be hardened into a semivowel, and joined to the syllable of the Personal signs. These explanations may clear up the inflection of most of the Perfect-Stems; e. g. ንሕኀ, *nagárat*, *nagárka*, *nagárkī*, *nagárkū*; *nagarū*, *nagarā*⁽²⁾, *nagar-*

⁽¹⁾ On the conditions of accentuation cf. TRUMPP, p. 525, and KÖNIG, p. 160 sqq.

⁽²⁾ [TRUMPP, p. 525, followed by PRAETORIUS, 'Aethiop. Gramm.' p. 46, puts the accent on the 2nd last syllable in the 3rd pl.:—*nagárū*, *nagárā*. TR.]

kémmū, nagarkén, nagárna. Or from **አስተርከበ**, *astárkabat, astarkábka*,—*astarkabú, astarkabkémmū*. But we must again call attention here to the fact that the four Personal signs of the second Person and the sign of the first Pers. Sing. assimilate their **ከ** to a preceding radical **ገ** or **ቀ**, *e. g.* **ዐረጊ** ‘*arāggī*, for **ዐረግከ**; **ነደቅሙ** *nadaqqémmū*, for **ነደቅከሙ** (§ 54); and that when two **ከ**’s or two **ነ**’s meet together in such circumstances, the letter in each case is written once only; **መሐከ** *mahákka*, **ከደነ** *kadánna*, **ድኅነ**, *Gadla Ad.* 135, 19; **ኮነ** *kónna* 1st Plur., *ibid.* 23, 9; 25, 10; *Hen.* 103, 11; [**አመነ**, *e. g.* *Chrest.* p. 98, l. 24; *Kebra Nag.*, 90 b 8] (§ 55).

The following peculiar Perfect-Stems deserve special notice:—

(a) *Perfects which have the semi-passive vowel ě (instead of a) after the second radical*, viz. St. I, 1 in the Intransitive pronunciation, and St. III, 1 in the pronunciation **ተገብረ**,—transform their *ě* into the stronger *á* (60)⁽¹⁾, in all those Persons where it stands in a closed syllable with the accent; thus though we have **ገብረት** and **ተገብሩ**, **ተገብረ**, we have also **ገበርከ** and **ተገበርከ**, and they maintain this *a* also in both forms of the Second Person Plural, where the accent rests on the Personal sign; thus we never have **ገበርከሙ** or **ተገበርከን**, but always **ገበርከሙ**, **ተገበርከን**; and from **ረኮሰ**:—**ረከሰከ**, **ረከሰከሙ**.

(b) The *Perfects* of the Stems I, 1; III, 1 & 2 from roots *mediae gutturalis*, in the semi-passive form of pronunciation **ጥሕረ**, **ተግዕዘ**, **ተጽአለ**, may retain this *ě*-form throughout the whole Conjugation, thus, *e. g.* **ጥሕርከ**, **ተግዕዝከ**, **ተጽአለከ** (v. Table III); and, in fact, this must be done by the Perfects of those Simple Stems, which in the Ground-form admit this Intransitive form alone, like **ለህቀ**, for instance. But many admit in the first Stem the *ă*-form of pronunciation as well as the *ě*-form (v. § 76 *ad fin.*) and besides, in the case of all of them, both pronunciations are possible in Stems III, 1 & 2⁽²⁾. Accordingly one may quite as well say **መሐርከ**, **ተግዕዝከ**, **ተጽአለከ** &c. Different manuscripts vary between the forms very considerably, in the case of such words⁽³⁾. Such types, however, should in the first place be pronounced *mehérka, ta-ge-‘ézka* or

(1) Cf. PHILIPPI, ‘*Beitr. z. Assyriol.*’ II, p. 378 sq.

(2) **ተትሕተ**, however, appears always to keep the *ě*-pronunciation.

(3) V., *e. g.*, *Gen.* 16, 13, Note.

more shortly, *tag-éška*, *ta-se-'élka*, although it can hardly be doubted that the later Abyssinians, who gave a soft pronunciation to all the Aspirates, like *mēhra*, *tagē'za*, *tašē'la*, said also *mēhrka*, *tagē'zka*, *tašē'lka* (v. § 46 *ad f.*).—*Roots tertiae gutturalis*, in all the Perfect-Stems, restore the *a* after the second-last radical, before all the terminations which begin with a consonant, but, in accordance with § 46, it must be lengthened into *ā*: መልአ, መላእክ; ነስሐ, ነሳሕ; ባልሐ, ባላሕ; አግብአ; አግባእክ; አጸብሐ, አጸባሕክ, ገፍተአ, ገፍታእክ &c., while, before all terminations which begin with a vowel, they retain the *ě* of the second-last radical: ገፍተአት, ገፍተኡ, ገፍተኣ &c.

(c) *The tri-radical roots mediae geminatae*, in the semi-passive pronunciation of the Perfect of Stems I, 1 and III, 1, take, no doubt, the contracted form ነዱ, ተነቡ, ተነባ before all terminations beginning with a vowel, instead of *nadēdū*, *tanabēbū* &c.; but, before all terminations beginning with a consonant, where *a* must appear instead of *ě* (v. *supra*), the two repeated letters are always kept separate by this *a*, thus ተነብብኩ, ተነብብክሙ &c. ምዕዐ, the only Ethiopic root which has the same guttural as second and third radical, is regularly conjugated in the Perfect of St. II, 1, አምዕዐ, አምዕክ &c.; but, in accordance with § 97, it may have in St. III, 1, either the full form ተምዕዐ, or the contracted ተምዐ. The former is conjugated ተምዕክ, ተምዕዐ- &c., but the latter like a Perfect of St. I, 2 of a root *tertiae gutturalis*, thus ተምዐ, ተማዕክ, ተምዐ-⁽¹⁾ &c.

(d) *Roots mediae infirmae*, whether they be *tertiae gutturalis* or not, in all the Perfect-Stems which have the mixed-sound pronunciation in the Ground-form, retain this pronunciation throughout all the other Persons, like ሐረ, ሐርክ; ቦአ, ቦእክ; አሞተ, አሞትክ; አቤተ, አቤትክ; ኮነ *kōnna*, “we have become” Hen. 103, 11. But when they have hardened their radical vowel into a semivowel in the Ground-form, as in ጠየቀ, አዕወረ, ተፈወሰ, or have a diphthongal pronunciation, as in ተሐወሰ, ተሠደመ, *taḥausa*, *tašaima*, they carry the hardened pronunciation right through the whole formation, thus ጠየቅሙ, አዕወርክ, ተፈወስክ, ተሐወስክ, ተሠደምክ. Verbs, which in Stems II, 1 and IV, 1 have the shortened form

(1) Thus, according to LUDOLF; but ተምዕዕክ also appears, *e. g.* Ex. 32, 12.

አቀመ, አብሐ, አስተብሐ, are conjugated like the Perfects of the Simple Stem: **አቀምክ, አባሕክ, አስተባሕክ**.

(e) *Vowel-ending* tri-radical and multi-radical roots must in all Perfect-Stems (v. *supra*) harden their last radical into a semi-vowel before those terminations which begin with a vowel; but before all those which begin with a consonant they must sound that radical as a vowel. Since farther the second radical has generally *a* in this case, *u* or *i* as third radical combines with this *a* first of all into a diphthong: **ተለውክ, ገነይክ, በለይክ** from **በለየ, ሣቀይክ, ተጸሐየይክ, ተጎረይክ, አስተስረይክ, ጌገይክ, ያወውክ, ተዘያነውክ, አንሶሰውክ**, and the diphthong is usually retained. But those roots at least which end in *ū* may modify the diphthong farther into a mixed sound: **ተሎክ, ተፈቶክ, ሐዮክ, መጽሎክ** Gadla Ad. 21, 21; and the verb **ሀለወ** “to be”, in particular, very commonly does so; thus we have not only **ሀሎክ, ሀሎክሙ, ሀሎን** &c., but even **ሀሎት** instead of **ሀለወት**, inasmuch as one may, in accordance with § 91, say **ሀሎ** for **ሀለወ** itself. Less frequently the mixed sound appears in roots which end in *i*, as in **ጎሬክሙ**, Josh. 24, 22; Judges 10, 14; and in **ተላሄክ**, Judges 16, 17; Ex. 29, 17. Multi-literal roots have the mixed sound more frequently than have the Triliteral, because the Stems which are formed out of them are longer and are therefore abbreviated as much as possible.—Triliteral roots *tertiæ infirmæ*, and which at the same time are *mediæ gutturalis* and have an intransitive form of pronunciation, take a peculiar conjugation, like **ርእየ** “to see”; **ርዕየ** “to herd (a flock)”; **ወዕየ** “to burn” (**ንህየ, ጥዕየ, ምህወ, ጽሕወ**). When terminations beginning with a consonant are applied to these verbs, types would arise in the first place, according to what has been said (v. *supra*, under *b*), like *re-’é-î-ka*, but the *é* is regularly thrust aside by the radical (§ 51), and thus we have *re-’î-ka*, **ርእከ** &c.⁽¹⁾ (v. Table III). It cannot yet be said with certainty, whether those roots, which end in *u* (**ምህወ, ጽሕወ**), likewise follow this formation, seeing that they have not yet been supported by instances in the Persons concerned. It is possible that in these Persons they pass into the *a*-pronunciation (**ጸሐውክ**). Even **ርእየ** in St. III, 1, before terminations which begin with a consonant, falls back into the

(¹) **ርእይክ** Hab. 3, 2, 7 Cod Laur.; **ርእይክም** Amos 9, 1 Cod Laur.; [**ርእከ** for **ርእከ**, *Kebra Nag.* 25, Note 23.]

a-pronunciation, so that although we say **ተርአየ**, **ተርአዩ** &c. we have **ተረአይከ** &c.—Doubly weak roots like **ሐይወ**, **ረወየ**, **ጐየ**, in accordance with what has been said in § 69, present no special features: **ሐየውከ**, **ረወይከ**, **ጐየይከ** &c.

§ 103. 2. *The attachment of the Personal signs in the Subjunctive and the Imperfect [or Indicative].* As regards, first of all, the *Personal prefixes* **ይ**, **ት**, **ኦ**, and **ኃ**, the manner in which **ይ** is set before the Stem has already been dealt with in §§ 92—99; and all that has been said of **ይ** holds good of the other three also. Whenever the following radical has a syllable-vowel of its own,—as in the Imperfects of all Ground-Stems, in the Subj. of St. I, 2, 3 of the Triliteral Verb and of St. I of the Multiliteral, as well as in the Subj. of St. I, 1 of Vowel-centred and Vowel-beginning roots of weak formation—, these prefixes are uttered with a fugitive *ě*, and with *a* only when the following radical is a guttural, according to § 44. We have therefore not only **የዐርግ**, **የዐንዝር**, but also **የሐዝ**, **የዐል** from **ውሐዝ**, **ውዕል**. But when these prefixes form along with the first radical a single (closed) syllable, as in the Subj. I, 1 of most of the Tri-radical Verbs, they are uttered with the full vowel *e*. Farther, in all Reflexive Stems formed by **ተ**, the Personal prefix closes with this **ተ**,—which gives up its *a*—, into **ይት**⁽¹⁾, in which proceeding the rules, explained in §§ 54, 55, must be attended to. Finally, the prefixes combine with the **ኦ** of the Causative Stems II and IV, as well as of the Reflexive Stem V, into **ያ**, **ታ**, **ኦ**, **ኃ**. *The Personal Suffixes* (which are the same in the Subjunctive, the Imperative, and the Imperfect) consist of mere vowels *i*, *u*, *ā*. They draw the tone of the word to themselves throughout, thus: **ይገብሩ**, **ትነግሪ**, **ይፈጽማ** *yegabrú*, *tenagrí*, *yefē-semá*⁽²⁾. As vowel-suffixes they attract the final letter of the Stem to their syllable, and when that letter is a vowel, as in roots *tertiæ infirmæ*, it must be hardened into the corresponding semi-vowel. But although the final letter of the last syllable of the Stem moves forward into the syllable of the termination, and the

Attachment of Personal Signs in the Imperfect—[Indicative and Subjunctive].

⁽¹⁾ Differing thus from the method followed in Arabic, which here also shows itself richer in vowels.—The shortening of **ተ** into **ት** is the less surprising, when according to § 80 this **ተ** itself must in earlier times have sounded *it* or *et*.

⁽²⁾ Cf., however, TRUMPP, p. 526 sqq.

last-mentioned syllable attracts also the tone to itself, yet the formative or radical vowel of the last syllable of the Stem (which now stands in an open syllable) is kept unaltered, as in **ይልበስ**, **ትልበሰ**; **ይኑም**, **ይኑሙ**; **ይለድ**, **ትለዲ**; **ይንግር**, **ይንግሩ**; **ይባልሕ**, **ይባልሑ**; **ይፌጽም**, **ትፌጽማ**; **ያንግር**, **ታንግሪ** &c. Also, in cases where the formative vowel has been absorbed by a vowel occurring as third radical in the Ground-form, as in **ይበከ**, **ይትሉ**, **ይንጊ**, it must again appear, after the radical vowel has been hardened into a semivowel:—**ይበክያ**, **ይትልዉ**, **ትንግዩ**. In old manuscripts, however, types are found like **ይብከዩ** for **ይብክዩ** Abb. LV; 4 Esr. 6, 25; [**ይበከዩ** &c., v. *Kebrā Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XVI;] **ይሣቂዩ** Amos 6, 15 Cod. Laur.; **ይሰቲዩ** Amos 9, 14 Cod. Laur.⁽¹⁾. In altering the syllabic relations the following has to be noticed: If the last Stem-syllable has the formative vowel *ě*, as in **ይንግር**, or at least if it had it or should have it, as in **ይትሉ**, and if this last Stem-syllable is preceded by an open syllable with a short vowel,—either with *ă* (**ይንግር**, **ይትሉ**), or with *ě* (**ንግር**)—, then this *ă* or *ě* attracts to itself the first letter of the last Stem-syllable,—when along with its *ě* it is being isolated—, with the result that that letter gives up its *ě* and becomes attached to the preceding syllable as a vowel-less closing letter⁽²⁾: **ይንግር**, **ትንግሪ** *yenáger*, *tenagrí*; **ንግር**, **ንግሩ** *negér*, *negrú*; **ያስተረክብ**, **ያስተረክቡ** *yāstarákeb*, *yāstarakbú*⁽³⁾. Farther, if types like **ይመልእ**, **ይነውም**, **ይመይጥ**, are at least against analogy (§§ 43 and 50) pronounced *yemál-'e*, *yenáum*, *yemáit*, the forms **ትመልእ**, **ይነውሙ**, **ይመይጡ** are, on the other hand, necessarily pronounced *temal-'i*, *yenaumú*, *yemaitú*.

Verbs tertiae gutturalis: In all those cases in which the last Stem-syllable should have the formative vowel *a*, these verbs lengthen it in the Ground-form into *ā*: **ይምጸእ**, **ምጸእ**, **ይትመላእ**, **ይትፌሣሕ**, **ይትፈሣሕ**, **ይትጋባእ**, **ተጋባእ**, **ይትፈጥረጥ** &c. But if a Personal termination is applied, and the Aspirate is drawn into the following

(¹) In DILLMANN'S 'Chrest. Aeth.', p. 147, Str. 3, l. 2 the MS. offers **ረስዩ** in preference to **ረስዩ**.

(²) Cf., however, TRUMPP, p. 526 *sqq.*

(³) [Or more shortly:—In Impf. and Imper. forms, of the type *yenágēr*, *négēr*, the obscure *ě* of the last stem-syllable falls away before the increment of the personal vowel-suffixes *ī*, *ū*, *ā*; e. g. **ትንግር** *tenágēr* (2 *sg. m.*) becomes **ትንግሪ** *tenagrí* (2 *sg. f.*). TR.]

syllable, not only is the reason for lengthening the *a* removed, but by § 45 this formative *ä* must pass into *ě*, and then the second-last radical which introduces this *ě*,—in the special cases which have just been more precisely determined,—loses the *ě* entirely and becomes attached, as a vowel-less letter closing the syllable, to a preceding open syllable which has a short vowel, thus: **ጥጥ** **ጽኢ**; **ጥጽኢ** *meṣ-’ú* for *me-se-’ú*:—**ይትመልኡ**, *yetmal-’ú* for *yetma-le-’ú*: **ትትፈሥሐ**, **ትትፈሥሐ** *tetfaššeḥí* &c.⁽¹⁾ Only the few Subjunctives and Imperatives of vowel-beginning or vowel-centred roots of weak formation, which have been described in § 93,—viz. **ይፃእ** and **ፃእ** from **ወፅእ**, and **ይባእ**, **ባእ**, **ይማእ** from **ቦእ** and **ጥእ**,—preserve the long *ā* throughout the entire Conjugation, inasmuch as it serves at the same time to compensate for a rejected radical letter (v. Table III). **ይባእ**, **ይማእ** and **ባእ** are formed after the analogy of **ይፃእ** and **ፃእ**.

Double-lettered Verbs (፡፡). If in the Ground-form of these verbs the two like letters are separated merely by the weak vowel *ě*, and the first of them is preceded by an open syllable with a short vowel⁽²⁾, then in the case of forms which are increased by personal terminations (*cf. supra*) the two like letters are brought together, without any separating vowel, and they are in that case generally indicated in writing by one letter only. The assumed conditions in the ground-form are exemplified in **ይነብብ**, **ንብብ**, **ያነድድ**, **ያስተጎሥሥ**, **ይደመስስ**, **ያመረስስ**, but not in **ይከንን**, **ያከንን**, **ከንን**, **አከንን**, because in this case the first **ን** has to be pronounced as a doubled letter. The above forms, when increased by personal endings run thus:—**ይነቡ**, **ንቡ**, **ያነዱ**, **ያስተጎሡ**, **ይደመሱ**, **ያመረሱ**, but also with the letter repeated, as **ይነበቡ** (v. § 55)⁽³⁾. The Imperfects and Subjunctives from **አምዕዕ** and **ተምዕዕ**—, **ያምዕዕ** and **ይትመዓዕ** (§§ 96, 97) cannot yet be all substantiated, but they present nothing in their inflection, which might not be understood from the general rules, *e. g.* **ያምዕዕ**. Numb. 16, 30; Deut. 31, 20, 29;

(1) [Or,—Forms like **ጥጽኢ** + *ū* pass theoretically through the following changes:—*meṣā’ + ū = meṣā + ሁ = meṣě + ሁ = meṣ + ሁ = ጥጽኢ*. TR.]

(2) Cases like **ይጎሡ** for **ይጎሥሡ**. Cod. Pocock., Ps. 77, 9 rest on copyists' errors.—Notice the Subj. **ያንበለብል** *Fal.* f. 51 (*‘Lex.’*, col. 1235) from a multiliteral root.

(3) V., on the other hand, KÖNIG, p. 95.

Hen. 69, 1; or **ይትመዐዑ**. John 7, 23.—In like manner Imper. **ተምዕ** (§ 97), **ተምሂ**, **ተምዑ**, **ተምዓ**; or **ተምዕሂ**, **ተምዕዑ**, **ተምዕዓ**.

The Conjugation of Verbs *tertiæ infirmæ* presents no difficulty, seeing that *i*, *ū*, as well as the diphthongs and mixed sounds *ai*, *au*, *ē*, *ō* may be easily resolved into their corresponding semivowels, and that, according to § 52, all the groups of sounds, which occur in these cases, viz. *yī*, *yū*, *yā*, *wī*, *wū*, *wā*, are admitted in the Ethiopic language. The first Imperfect of **ሰህለ** (§ 92), **ይሴ**, which is employed as an Aorist, forms **ይሴ**, **ትሴ**, **ትሴሊ**, **እሴ**; **ይሴሉ**, **ይሴላ**, **ትሴሉ**, **ትሴላ**, **ንሴ** ⁽¹⁾. The second Imperfect **ይብል**, as well as the Subjunctive **ይበል** and the Imperative **በል**, together with the Imperfect of **ክህለ**, **ይክል** (§ 92) follow the ordinary rules: **ይበሉ**, **ይብሉ**, **ይክሉ**, **በሉ** &c.

FORMATION OF NOUNS.

Classes of
Nouns; and
Methods of
Stem-Form-
ation.

§ 104. Overagainst the Verb stands the Noun (*Naming-Word*), both the *Noun*, in the narrower sense of the term, which is derived from roots conveying a notion or conception, and the *Pronoun*, which is derived from demonstrative roots. The formation of Nouns, like that of Verbs, passes through stages three in number: 1. The Nominal Stem is formed from the Root; 2. the Stem is then differentiated by Genders and Numbers; 3. the words thus elaborated assume special forms, or Cases, according to the special relations upon which they enter in the Sentence. This formation, however, in the case of Pronouns, differs in some respects from that of Nouns properly so-called; and farther, amongst Nouns themselves the Numerals have much that is peculiar, and in some points they share too in the peculiarities of Pronouns. Accordingly in the account to be given of Nouns, we distinguish these three classes: 1. *Nouns*, in the narrower sense of the term; 2. *Pronouns*; 3. *Numerals*.

(¹) Cf. TRUMPF, p. 526.

A. FORMATION OF NOUNS—IN THE NARROWER SENSE OF THE TERM.

I. STEM-FORMATION OF NOUNS.

Nouns are divided according to their signification, first of all into Words of Conception, or Conceptual words (*Abstract Nouns*), such as bring forward in the form of a Noun, an idea, an action, or a property purely by itself, like *Belief*, *Killing*, *Quickness*,—and into Words of Statement (*Concrete Nouns*), which state the notion as incorporated in some being or thing, and attached thereto. Concrete Nouns themselves are again divided into Self-dependent words (*Substantives*), which give a name to a person or thing in accordance with a conception or notion perceived by the mind as having been realised in the one or the other, *i. e.*, *Names of persons and of things*, and words which are not Self-dependent (*Adjectives*), but which state a conception as being realisable in a person or thing, and therefore always involve a reference to a person or thing, to which they are ready to be attributed, *i. e.* *Descriptive or Qualifying Words*. These two distinctions between Nouns, in accordance with their meaning, are not in themselves very stable.—An Abstract Noun may, by a slight alteration of the sense, be turned into the name of a thing or a person (as *e. g.* *Clothing* may first of all mean *the act of clothing*, but afterwards also *the dress*; and in like manner, *First-birth* may come to mean *the first-born*); or it may take the place of a descriptive word (as in: ‘God is truth’); and a descriptive word may easily become the name of a person or a thing. Nevertheless, that fundamental distinction must be adhered to in treating of Formation, seeing that for the proper understanding of Stem-formation the main consideration is,—what was the original meaning of a word, and not what is its derived meaning. Special classes of Nouns, besides, are formed by *Infinitives* and *Participles*. They are distinguished from other Nouns by issuing from the Stems of the verb, and not directly from the root. They are accordingly more closely connected with the verb than is any other Noun (*Verbal Nouns*), and they set forth the conception contained in the verb in its Stem-determination⁽¹⁾,

(1) But the Participle and the Infinitive in Semitic, as is well-known, accompany the Verb no farther than up to the distinction between the Verbal Stems. They do not share in the Tense distinction.

either as a purely Conceptional word (*Infinitive*), or as a Descriptive or Attributive word (*Participle*). Of each of these two classes there are to be found, in those Semitic tongues which still retain their full wealth of form, as many forms as the Verb has Stems. But Ethiopic has sustained serious loss, at least in the domain of the Participle. It is no longer capable of forming a Participle from every Verb in every one of its Stems; and only from a few Stems of comparatively few verbs has it retained the Participles, as the scattered remains, so to speak, of an earlier stage of formation. — Still, it makes up for the Participle in another way. Infinitives are more regularly formed; but as they constitute a special Class of Nouns, we shall deal with them, only in concluding our survey of Nominal Stem-formation. On the other hand the description of the Participial forms, which are still retained in a dispersed condition, has been embodied in the account to be given of the other Nominal Stems,—for the reason, mainly, that such forms have, to some extent, assumed the meaning of ordinary Adjectives or Substantives.

The means employed in the formation of Nominal Stems have already been enumerated (§ 74), viz.: Inner vowel-change; Inner increase by doubling individual radicals; and Outward increase by attaching formative letters or syllables. And in particular the feminine Nominal ending is made use of, even in carrying out the formation of the Nominal Stem itself and in establishing its meaning, inasmuch as Conceptional words and the stronger Abstract Nouns are readily conceived as being of the feminine gender. The Inner vowel-change is unlimited; but as regards multiplicity in the forms produced thereby, Ethiopic is inferior to Hebrew and Arabic, first of all because it has now only two short vowels. It has not even kept all those forms,—still in use in other tongues—, which it might have done, even with its more slender stock of vowels, but it has been content in this matter, as in others, with what is most necessary and essential, and has allowed whatever else once existed to disappear. Thus in many cases older forms, or common Semitic forms, are now represented merely by a few fragments from ancient times, or by words brought in from a foreign source.

Nouns in the narrower sense of the term (apart from Participles and Infinitives) are derived either from the root (Primitive Nouns), or from other Nouns (Denominative Nouns). Of the latter

class Ethiopic has a large number. In particular, conceptional words, words denoting properties, and their relative attributive words, are often derived in this way. Individual Nouns, besides Infinitives and Participles proper, are also formed from derived Verbal Stems, chiefly when the Verbal Stem expresses a simple idea and makes up in this way for a Simple Stem which is wanting.

In reviewing the Stem-formation of Nouns we start from simple and original forms, and advance to Compounds (in which several formative expedients have been co-operating) and to Derivatives.

The simplest and most general method of formation is that which makes use of *Inner vowel-change*; for every Nominal form has definite formative vowels, which convey its meaning. *Inner increase of the radicals* constitutes the second stage of formation; and *External formative devices* furnish the third. In all three stages, however, the vocalisation is of essential importance. Its nature cannot generally be described beforehand; but when compared with the vocalisation of the Verb, the peculiarity of that of the Noun is shown in a preference for longer, weightier and broader vowels (¹).

Like the Tenses of the Verb the Nominal Stems in Ethiopic once also ended in Vowels; and this vowel-ending, through the change of vowels happening in it, served at the same time to denote the different relations of the Noun in the Sentence, viz. the Cases (v. § 142 *sqq.*). This vowel-ending, however, without assuming which a series of Nominal forms could not have been accounted for, was, in accordance with § 38, given up at an early stage, at least in the Ground-form of the Nominal Stem.

1. SIMPLE NOMINAL STEMS.

§ 105. 1. *The simplest Nominal formation consists in the establishment of a short but accented vowel after the first radical:* The second radical is vowel-less; and the third, which once had the general vowel-ending of all Nominal Stems, was, later on, given without a vowel (§ 38) (²). This form stands in direct contrast with

1. First and Simplest Formation: with accented Short Vowel after 1st Radical.

(¹) On the Tone-relations of the Noun v. TRUMPP, p. 531 *sqq.*, and KÖNIG, p. 154 *sqq.*

(²) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 532; KÖNIG, p. 145.—Corresponding forms appear in Hebrew מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ; קֶדֶשׁ, קֶדֶשׁ, קֶדֶשׁ; Arabic قَتَلَ, قَتَلَ, قَتَلَ; Aramaic מַלְכָּא, מַלְכָּא, מַלְכָּא.

the coinage of the root as a Verb (where a vowel follows the *second* radical). It has at first always the force of a pure Conceptional word, like **ብትከ** “gap”, **ሀቲል** “corruption”, **ውጎድ** “fewness”, **ወርድ** “breadth”. But by virtue of farther modification of the meaning (§ 104) these Conceptional words were often employed to designate objects and substances in which the idea becomes realised, so that this form goes on to furnish expressions for names of things, names of persons, plants, animals, and the like, *e. g.* **ልብስ** (“clothing”) “dress”, **ነፍስ** (“breath”) “soul”, **ብርት** (“cutting”) “brass”, **ወልድ** (“birth”) “son”, **ወርኅ** “moon”, **ከርሥ** “belly”, **ከልብ** “dog” &c. Many very old words especially, the roots of which are no longer used at all as Verbs, like **ዐይን** “eye”, are formed in this way. But pure Adjectives are not expressed in this form⁽¹⁾. The vowel which is established in the first part of the form is either *ā* or *ē* in Ethiopic. Into this *ē* have been taken the *ü* (*o*) and *ī* (*e*) of the allied languages; but in a few roots beginning with Aspirate-gutturals an original *u* has, in accordance with § 26, endeavoured to save itself by taking refuge in a Guttural or an Aspirate, like **ጉርን** “threshing-floor” (ገን), **ጉንድ** “Stem” (ገን), **ኩሕል** “dye for the eyes” (كحل), **ቀስጥ** “costus” (قسط), **ቀር** “cold” (ገገ), **ኩል** “totality” (كل)⁽²⁾. Any essential difference in meaning between words with *a* and words with *e* is, generally speaking, no longer discernible. When this form has been produced in both modes of pronunciation by one and the same root, these modes often have also different significations attached to them, in such a way that in some cases the word which contains *a* has a more active meaning or one more connected with a person,—while that which contains *e* conveys a more passive meaning or one more suggestive of a thing, as **ገብር** “slave”, **ግብር** “business”; **ነግድ** “foreigner”, **ንግድ** “journey”; but also with other kinds of difference, as in—: **ንእስ** “youth”, **ናእስ**

(¹) For **ይምን**, **ድኅር**, **ፅግም** never mean *dexter*, *posterior*, *laevus*, as LUDOLF thinks, but “the right, back, left side”; and **ኂር** “good” خَيْر is doubtless merely an abbreviated form of خَيْر and thus belongs originally to a different formation.

(²) Farther **ቀርቦ**, **ቀንጽ**, **ቀጽል**, **ቁልሕ**; **ኩርህ**, **ኩስሕ**, **ጉልቀ**; also **ቀይጽ** “leg”.—The view propounded above is also approved of by TRUMPP, p. 532, but contested by KÖNIG wrongly, pp. 45, 52.

“smallness”; **ሐብል** “rope”, **ሕብል** “cunning”; **ፍትሕ** “judgment”, **ፈትሕ** “solution”. But frequently both forms are used with like meaning, as **ርሕብ** and **ራሕብ** “breadth”; **ርምሕ** and **ረምሕ** “spear”; **ዕርቅ** and **ዐርቅ** “reconciliation”; **ቅጽር** and **ቀጽር** “citadel”; **ቅንክ** and **ቀንክ** “envy”; **ነፍቅ** and **ንፍቅ** “chest”, “box”; **ቀጽል** and **ቄጽል** “leaf”; **ኑልቀ** and **ኑልቀ** “number”; **ጸልክ** and **ጽልክ** “hatred”; **ዳገን** and **ድገን** “well”, “weal”;—for seeing that on the one hand, *a* may be softened into *e* (§ 18), and that on the other, Aspirates and Aspirate-resembling letters (like **ቀ** in the examples adduced) have a preference for the *a*-sound, this alternation between *a* and *e* in certain words is easily explained, and there is no need to assume the existence of two original forms. Finally, we must not fail to notice⁽¹⁾ that several of these words which have *á* are nothing other than somewhat maimed forms of original Participles of the type **ጋብር**. This is the case possibly with **ገብር** “slave”,—originally “a worker”, and **ዐርክ** “friend” &c. On the pronunciation of these words *cf. supra*, § 38.

A *Middle-Aspirate* exerts no influence on the *é*-formation:—**ዝኡብ** “wolf”, **ምዕር** “a time”, **ምእት** “a hundred”; but in the *á*-formation it lengthens that vowel into *ā* (§ 46):—**ጋእዝ** “quarrel”, **ዛእቅ** “mockery”.

Roots mediae geminatae in both formations leave their double-letter unresolved⁽²⁾:—**ልብ** “heart”, **ሐግ** “law”, **ሥን** “beauty” (سُنَّة), **ስን** “tooth”, **ዝቅ** “a skin”, “bottle” (زِقَّة), **ድብ** “a bear” (دُب), **ግብ** “pit” (جُب), **ፍት** “piece” and “gift” (Judges 19,5; Jas. 1,17), **ምት** “husband” (*Pl. አምታት*); **ሐጽ** “arrow” (ሃጽ), **ሠቅ** ሠቅ, **ረቅ** “leaf of paper”, **በክ** “emptiness”, **ነድ** “flame”, **ተን** “vapour”, “smoke” (نَبْل), **ደቅ** “little one”, **ዐር** “enemy”, **ጠል** “dew”, **ጠፍ** “an infant” (ጣፍ) (frequently employed in the Abyssinian Chronicles).

From *Vowel-beginning roots* this formation is always strong: **ይምን** “right side”, **የብስ** “firm or dry land”, “continent”, **ውስጥ** “interior”, **ውጥድ** “fewness”, **ወልድ** “son”, **ወትር** “sinew” (ወትር).

In the formation from *roots mediae infirmae* the vowel *é*

(1) V. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 146, Note.

(2) Accordingly **ጥን** must also be read for **ጥንን** in LUDOLF’s Dictionary col. 562: **ቲን** “length” might be merely a lengthened form of **ትን**, but it may also come from a root **ቴን**=ጸን.

(§ 50) is displaced by the radical vowel, thus:—**ሐስ** “reproof”, **ሚን** “cunning”, **ቢጽ** “comrade”, **ቂም** “revenge”, **ኪን** “art”, **ጢስ** “smoke” (طَسَان وَطِيس), **ሲስ** “dropsy” (غُب), **ጺእ** “filth” (ጽፃ), **ኑህ** “length”, **ፁግ** “baseness”; **ሠብ** “tinder” (شَبُوع)⁽¹⁾. On the other hand, the vowel *ā* forms with the radical vowel *a* a diphthong, which is often retained, especially in words from roots *primae* or *tertiæ gutturalis*, but which often also blends into a mixed sound:—**ሀይድ** “plunder”, **ሰይፍ** “sword”, **ኅይል** “power”, **ሐይቅ** “shore”, **አይህ** “flood”, **ጸይሕ** “street”, **ወይን** “wine”, **ዐይን** “eye” (**ዐይግ**, **ደይን**, **ዘይት**, **ገይብ**, **ሠይእ**), **ዐውድ** “circuit”, **ዘውግ** “pair”, **ለውሕ** “table” (*tabula*), **ዘውብ** and **ዛውብ** “jests”, **አውል** “vapour”, **ሰውጥ** “scourge” (**ቀውብ**, **ከውር**); or **ሢጥ** “price”, **ቤት** “house”, **ዴር** “cloister” (دَيْر), **ሚስ** “mead”⁽²⁾, **ኬድ** βάσις Sap. 13, 18, **ሞት** “death”, **ሞቅ** “warmth”, **ቆም** “growth”, **ዮም** “today”, **ያፍ** “bird”, **ያም** “tree”, **ኅሕ** “dawn” (ሦክ, ሶር, ኀል, ኀር, ጸም, ጸር, ጸጥ, ሮስ). But together with these genuine Ethiopic forms, there occurs also another pronunciation,—one with long *ā*,—particularly in some very old words. This *ā* proves in most cases to have been simplified from *ō* in the Ethiopic and Arabic manner (§ 18)⁽³⁾: **ቃል** “word” (*cf. supra*), **ዳር** “race” (not **ዶር**), **ቃስ** “breeches” (*cf. كَوْت*); often under the influence of an Aspirate: **ሃፍ** “sweat”, **ላሕ** “mourning” (whence **ሀፈወ** and **ለሐወ** seem to be derived), **ባብ** “span” (بَاع), **ዓም** “year”, **ሳብ** “hour” (as well as **ሰዓት**, سَاعَة, properly “moment”, ስዓት).—On the other hand **ፋል** “good omen” appears to be shortened from **ፋእል** (فَال), and **ዓው** “curvature” from a form like **عَوَّا** and **عَوَّة**; finally **ዳስ** “hut” seems to be originally an Arabic Participle **دَاس** (*cf. دَسِيعَة*), or a lengthened form of **ደስ**.

Roots tertiae infirmæ neither reject their last radical, if we except a few very old words of uncertain derivation, nor introduce the vowel-pronunciation, but on the contrary invariably harden

(¹) **ሰውጥ** Cantic. 7, 3 cannot be a Substantive, as LUDOLF assumes, but is a Part. Fem.; **ጽውብ** “invitation” is derived from the Intensive Stem of the verb.

(²) Perhaps also **ጺው** “salt”, root **ሄ** or **ሀ** صرى.

(³) V. EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ §§ 73, 387.

it into a semivowel, and thus possess a thoroughly strong formation. This formation, however, has its explanation solely in the assumption (§ 38) that at one time all nouns, including these, ended in a short vowel; and it is precisely in words of this formation that such vowels must of necessity be given utterance to, in order to render them pronounceable⁽¹⁾. The forms of this sort, known as yet, are: **ሥርወ** *šérwē* “root”, **ግጽወ** “representation”, **እግወ** or **እጉ** “brother”, **ጽጉ** “a lane” (= **ጽግወ** ጸገሠ), **ሕቀ** “an odoriferous wood” (cf. **حَبَق**); **ሳሕወ** “extension”, **በድወ** “wilderness” (**بَدَا**), **ቃግወ** “emulation”, **ራእይ** “face”, **ላሕይ** “beauty”, **ናህይ** “recreation”, “refreshment”. Obviously this formation has become very rare; and there is no example of it where the word has the vowel *é* and itself comes from a root ending in *ī*⁽²⁾. The rarity of such words might occasion astonishment, were it not sufficiently explained by the circumstance, that when the final vowel had been dropped in the later pronunciation, the whole of this formation was allowed to fall out of use, and,—so far as pure conceptional words ought to have been formed in it,—was replaced by another formation (§ 106). Farther, a few very old words appear, which have only two radicals, but which,—sometimes before a Suff. Pron. and in the Pl., sometimes in derivatives,—pass into tri-radical roots with final *u*. They are therefore to be enumerated here, although in stray cases the tri-radical root is only derived from them, and not they from the root: **ዕድ** “man”, **ስም** “name”, **እድ** “hand”, **ዕዕ** “tree”, **ጥብ** “female breast”, **ስት**, **ሰት** “papyrus”, **ደም** “blood”⁽³⁾, **ገጽ** “face”, **አፍ** “mouth”, **ሐጽ** “arrow”, **አብ** “father”, **ሐም** “father-in-law”. As regards their formation, it is not indeed certain that all of them have been formed precisely according to the first form here assumed by us; but in their type they resemble mostly those words which belong to the first formation; and since their true genesis, from its extreme antiquity, can no longer be established with certainty, and at all events cannot be classified under any of the modes of formation still in force in the language, we have set them down among Nouns of the simplest form.

An onomatopoeic word of this formation is **ጽዕ** “raven”

(1) V. however TRUMPP, p. 532.

(2) For **ርእይ** is an Infinitive and of quite another origin.

(3) Whence **ጸገ** seems to have been derived. [—A doubtful derivation.]

[also **ጉጉ**, a word of similar meaning *Kebra Nag.*, 122 b 17, *var.*]. The following foreign words too have been altered in accordance with this form, viz.:—**ሀንድ** “India”, **ጽርእ** “Greece”, **ፍሥሕ** “passover”, **ለጎጽ** “λέντιον”, **ተይ** or **ትይ** “brimstone” (*ῥεῖλον*) &c.

Several of these forms, especially of those which have received the signification of common Nouns, passed over to the feminine type, like **ጎይመት** “tent” (*خَيْمَة*), **ጽግነት** “bat”, **ጽፍነት** “wallet”, (*صَفْنَة*), **ገነት** “garden”, **ቀንክት** “*galbanum*”, **ሐሞት** “bile” (for **ሐምወት**), **ሰከት** and **ሰኩት** “street”, “lane”, (related to **ጽጉ** v. *supra*), **ኅግነት** “door” (*خَوْخَة*), **ኖራ** “lime” (*نُورَة*), and several others ending in *ā* (§ 127).

2. Second
Formation:
—with
accented
Short Vowel
or Tone-long
Vowel after
2nd Radi-
cal:—

§ 106. 2. The Second mode of formation consists in *the establishment of an accented short vowel, or a tone-long vowel, after the second radical*. Words of this form are Verbal Nouns. They give evidence at once of this relationship of theirs to the Verb by the position of their formative vowel after the second radical, inasmuch as the Verb has its essential vowel precisely in that place. In meaning they are either conceptional words of an Infinitive type, derived from the old Imperfect, or Descriptive words, derived from the Perfect⁽¹⁾. A subdivision naturally takes place into two classes, according as the words issue from the Imperfect or the Perfect.

Conception-
al Words
derived as
Verbal
Nouns from
the
Imperfect
(Subjunc-
tive form):—

(1) *Conceptional (or Abstract) words derived from the Imperfect*,—corresponding to Infinitives and Substantives of an Infinitive form in other Semitic languages. The old Imperfect, *i. e.* the Subjunctive (§ 91), in Ethiopic has for its vowel *é* or *á*, the former for the Transitive Verb, the latter for the Intransitive; and these two vowels must turn up also in the conceptional words derived from it.

With
original
Transitive *é*
after
2nd Radical,
but now
with Fem.-
ending at,
and Accent
on the
1st Syllable.

(a) *Conceptional words, however, with an accented é after the second radical* are no longer met with. The *é* proved too weak to keep the tone⁽²⁾, and so they passed over in a body to *the Feminine form* (§ 104),—as when, *e. g.*, instead of **ሰብር** *sebér*, we have **ሰብረት** (*sébrat*, the accent going to the 1st syllable) “breach”, and it was only by this Feminine-ending thus assumed, that they were kept from being confounded with the First Simple formation by

(1) V. on this point EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 148, a.

(2) Just as it also lost the tone in the Subj., § 92.

means of *é*. This Feminine-ending *at*, less frequently *ā*, (§ 127 *b*) is very common⁽¹⁾. It is the form in which *Nomina actionis*, in accordance with their meaning, almost invariably appear, such as **ፋጸት** “running”, “career”, **ረክበት** “discovery”, **ረገዘት** “piercing through”, or Abstract words of Quality like **ስክረት** “drunkenness”, **ርጥበት** “dampness”; rarely, Common Nouns like **ሕዝአት** (‘lair’) “stall”, **ምትሀት** (‘apparition’) “spectre”, **ስቀረት** (‘excavation’) “hole”, **ቀላፈት** (‘the being uncircumcised’) “foreskin”, **ሕልቀት** (‘circle’) “ring”, **ጥውቀት** “oppression”. When nouns of this type and those of the First formation are both developed from one root, then the former always signify action pure and simple:—**ሂደት** “plundering” (**ሀይድ** “plunder”), **ልብሰት** “putting on clothes” (**ልብስ** “clothes”), **ምልክት** “filling up”, “being full” (**ምልእ** “fulness”) &c. Such words are also formed from Middle-Aspirate and Final-Aspirate roots, although these have the vowel *a* in the Subj.,—like **ስሕተት** “error”, **ብሕአት** “fermentation”, **ውግአት** “butting”, **ጉድአት** “striking”, “stroke” &c., and in the same way from many intransitive roots. From roots *mediae geminatae* this form always runs like **ስጠት** *séttat* “rent”, “gap”, **ንደት** “fever”, **ግሰት** “touch”, **ጉየት** “flight”, (“escape”), **ሥረት** “flying” (of a bird), **ሕመት** “blackness”, “ink”, **ፍተት** “piece”, “fragment”, **መዐት** “anger” (§ 44). Roots beginning with *ū* have often the strong form in such words, even when the Subj. has the weak, as in **ውሕዘት** “flowing”, **ውግረት** “throwing”, “cast”, **ውግአት** “butting”, **ውዴት** “accusation” (v. *infra*), but in most cases they have the weak form:—**ልደት** “birth”, **ርደት** “descent”, **ርቀት** “spitting”, **ዕለት** (‘duration’) “day”, **ድቀት** “fall”, **ፀአት** (§ 44) “exit”, and analogous to it **በአት** “entrance” from **ቦአ** (§ 68). In cases where the two forms,—strong and weak—, both occur, they have different meanings:—**ዕየት** “brand-mark”, **ውዕየት** “burning”; **ግዘት** “anathema”, **ውግዘት** “excommunication”. Several others of these words are given with an intimately attached feminine-ending (§ 128):—**ጥንት** “beginning” (**ውጥንት** “the commencing”), **ቅሥት** “strife”, **ግብት** “a

(¹) In Hebrew, forms like עֲוִירָה, מְבַרְכָה, נִרְצָה &c. correspond, EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ § 150; in Arabic, فَعَلَات &c.—On Tone-relations v. TRUMPF, p. 533. —According to KÖNIG, p. 77, these Feminine forms would belong to Nouns of the FIRST formation.

sudden occurrence”, **ሕስት** “loan”, **ሀብት** “gift”, in which the *a* of **የሀብ** has held its ground, by virtue of the Aspirate.

Forms from *Roots mediae infirmae* exhibit invariably⁽¹⁾, in accordance with § 50, the vowel-pronunciation of the middle radical: **ሙተት** “dying”, **ሐረት** “going”, **ቁመት** “standing”, **ዑረት** “blindness”, **ፁገት** “baseness”; **ሚጠት** “turning”, **ኒጠት** “deceit”, **ሢመት** (‘installation’) “office”, **ዒለት** “emigration”, **ቂሐት** “redness”; and only those roots, which are, besides, *tertia infirmae*, have forms with a diphthongal pronunciation, like **ሕይወት** “life”, **ጥውየት** “distortion”. On **በአት** v. *supra*.

In the case of *Roots tertiae infirmae* this formation is all the more in use, that the employment of the first, simple formation for these roots has greatly declined (§ 105). In accordance with § 40, the type is either **ኅርየት** “election”, **ርእየት** “face”, “aspect”, **ስቅየት** “irrigation”, **ዕርየት** “equalising”, **ቅቅየት** “avarice”, **ትልወት** “succession”, **ዕልወት** “apostasy”, **ክዕወት** “outpouring”, **ዝርወት** “dispersion”, — or **ምሴት** (as well as **ምስየት**) “evening”, **ንዴት** “poverty”, **ዕሴት** “recompense”, **ምኔት** (‘solitude’) “monastery”, **ፍኖት** (‘sending’) “way”; and in several words the two forms are used indifferently, like **ቅንየት** and **ቅኔት** “service”, **ርምየት** and **ርሜት** “throw”, **ርቅየት** and **ርቄት** “enchantment”, **ፍትወት** and **ፍቶት** “lust”; cf. *supra* p. 80. With **እ** prefixed (§ 34): **እብፊት** “alternation”. A few words which have an Aspirate (§ 44) or **ቀ** (§ 48) for their initial letter exhibit *a* in the first syllable instead of *ä*:—**ሕምየት** and **ሐሜት** “calumny”, **ሀኬት** “weariness”, **ሐሜት** “joy”, **ቀንአት** and **ቅንአት** “ardour” (Numb. 25, 11 Note), **ሐቅረት** “contempt”, **ቅፈት** and **ቀፈት** “density”, “hardness”, **ቀቶት** “bet”. Of a more Arabic character is the form⁽²⁾ **ሐሰት** ‘lie’, for **ሐስወት** from the root **ሐሰወ**, which, according to PRAETORIUS, ‘Beitr. z. Ass.’ I, p. 34, possibly comes from **حَسَّ**. Cf. *infra* also § 128.

With
Intransitive
ä after
2nd Radical.

§ 107. (b) *The formation with an intransitive a* is still retained in a variety of fashions.

(α) *The second Radical is pronounced with*⁽³⁾ *ä, the first,*

(1) LUDOLF, ‘Lex. Aeth.’ col. 564, adduces **ጥውመት**, but without a passage in support.

(2) EWALD, ‘Gr. Arab.’ § 410.

(3) At least originally having the Tone; cf. TRUMPF, p. 533. In Arabic

with fugitive *ë*. This type is formed only from intransitive or semi-passive verbs and is therefore by no means very common. To it belong words like **ጎጸር** “shortness”, **ዕመቅ** “depth”, **ቅጠን** “thinness”, **ሕሠም** “ugliness”; and from roots *mediae gutturalis* (§ 44): **ሠሐቅ** “laughter”, **ጸሐፍ** “census”, **ረሐብ** “width”, **ከሐድ** “denial”, **ረገብ** “hunger”; from roots *tertiæ gutturalis* **ትጋህ** “vigilance”, **ስራሕ** “fatigue”, **ጎጣእ** “lack”; in words *mediae geminatae*, the doubled letter is always opened out: **ጥበብ** “wisdom”, **ክበብ** “roundness”, **ቀጠጥ** “thinness”; *tertiæ infirmæ*: **እከይ** “vileness”, **ዕበይ** “magnitude”, or, by the diphthong becoming a mixed sound, **ስተይ** and **ስቴ** “drinking”, **ጽጌ** “bloom”, **ፍሬ** “fruit” (**ዕፂ**, **ጎሬ**, **ሕጼ**), perhaps also **ህሶ** “copious dew” (of obscure derivation)⁽¹⁾. Roots with initial *u* usually make the feminine take the place of this form (v. § 106); yet to this form belongs **ረቅ** “spittle” (on the other hand we have **ርቀት** “spitting”), and in like manner **ድድ** “foundation” (probably $\sqrt{\text{ጥጥ}}$)⁽²⁾. From a root beginning with *i* comes **ይበሕ** “aridity”, because this *i* is never discarded in the Subj. From roots *mediae infirmæ* this form is exceedingly rare (**ዕወር** “blindness”), and is replaced sometimes by the Feminine formation, as with roots just mentioned, and sometimes by the First Simple formation. Words of this formation now and then change it for the First Simple formation, still keeping the same meaning: **ግዘፍ** and **ግዝፍ** “density”, **እበድ** and **እብድ** “folly”.

(β) *The a may be lengthened into ā*⁽³⁾. The words concerned are thereby more detached from their affinity to the Verb and are raised from Infinitives into Substantives proper. They are not so much an expression of the action itself as the result rather of the action, and are mostly names of things. Examples: **ትረፍ** “remainder”, **ስካር** “drunkenness”, **ልማድ** “custom”, **ሕፃን** “child”, **ዝናም** “rain”, **ክታብ** “book” [Arabic loan-word, **كتاب**], **ስበር**

قَصَر and the like correspond (EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 240), and in Hebrew the intransitive Infinitives of the First Stem.

(1) Cf. BARTH, ZDMG XLII, p. 352 sq.

(2) That there is a word **ልድ** = **ወልድ** is not perhaps made clear by Gen. 17, 12, but without doubt it is so by Gen. 17, 23; Jer. 2, 14; Kuf. pp. 54, 59.

(3) [V. now on this formation and its passive meaning NÖLDEKE, ‘Beitr. z. sem. Sprachwiss.’, p. 30 sqq.]

“piece”, **ጽራብ** “chip”; *mediae gutturalis*: **ሥሐቅ** “mockery”; *tertiæ gutturalis*: **ጽባሕ** “morning”, **ርባሕ** “gain”, **ትፋእ** “sputum”; *mediae geminatae*: **ሕማም** “pain”, **ንዳድ** “fever”, **ሕራር** “heat”, **ሥዓዕ** “roughness”; *mediae infirmæ*: **ሕዋር** “portico” (“corridor”), **ንዋም** “sleep”, **ሕዋስ** “sense”, **ዕዋል** “foal”, **ስያሕ** “a costly vessel”, **ፍያል** “vial”, **ቅያእ** “vomit”; *tertiæ infirmæ*: **ብካይ** “weeping”, **ስታይ** “drink”, **ሥቃይ** “torment”, **ጥዋይ** and **ጠዋይ** “colic”, **ንዋይ** “vessel”, **ብጸው** “slumber”, **ፍታው** “desire”, **ንቃው** “tone”, and,— by rejecting the **ው** according to § 53,—**ግላ** “covering”, **ዕፃ** “lot”, **ፍፍ** “way”, **ሥጋ** “flesh” (*V*لحم)⁽¹⁾, **ዕዳ** “money-debt”, **ፍዳ** “re-compense”⁽¹⁾. A word with **እ** prefixed (§ 34) occurs in **እልታኅ** “dress” (*V*חלת). Traces of an original *ũ* in the first syllable are shown in **ጉዳድ** “ring”, “clasp”, **ኩፋር** “*infula*”, **ቊማል** “louse”. This formation appears now and then side by side with the First Simple formation: **ክላሕ** and **ክልሕ** “outcry”, **እንል** and **እጉል** “the young” (both of men and lower animals). For one or two Feminine forms of α and β v. § 128.

But these forms may be still farther extended by pronouncing the first syllable with the more definite vowel *a*. This is the most usual method of forming Common Nouns, as well as conceptional words.

(γ) *The type which has ä in both syllables*⁽²⁾ is to be regarded, sometimes as a farther formation from (α), inasmuch as one or two words still admit both forms indifferently, *e. g.* **ሰገም** and **ስገም** “barley”,—sometimes as a development of the First Simple formation⁽³⁾, with which it alternates still more frequently, *e. g.* **ሠረቅ** and **ሠርቅ** “rising”, **ሰምር** and **ሰመር** “productiveness”, **በቀል** and **በቅል** “mule”, **ተረፍ**, **ተርፍ** and **ትራፍ** “remainder” (**ነገድ** and **ነግድ**, **ዐነግ** and **ዐንግ**, **ዐደል** and **ዐድል**, **ፀቂን** and **ፀቅን**, **ገብጥ** and **ገበጥ** Sir. 34, 20), while even in other languages words of the First formation often correspond to them: **ፈለግ** **ፈላግ**, **ዐረብ** **ዐገጥ**⁽⁴⁾. Accordingly it cannot any longer be determined in all cases, which syllable supports the tone: In LUDOLF’S view it

(¹) Cf., however, KÖNIG, p. 116 sq.

(²) In Arabic عَجَب, عَجَب; in Hebrew עָבַר answers at one and the same time to our forms (β) and (γ).

(³) Cf. EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 240.

(⁴) V. farther, however, ZIMMERN, ‘Zeitschr. f. Ass.’ V, p. 385.

is always the first; cf. however TRUMPP, p. 534. Upon the whole this formation is very common, especially from strong roots: **በረድ** “hail”, **ፈረስ** “horse”, **ገመል** “camel”, **በለስ** “fig-tree”, **ዘነብ** “tail”, **ሀገር** “city”. Words beginning with **ዐ** are often inaccurately written with **ዓ**: **ዓለስ** “spelt”, (عَلَس), **ዓቀብ** and **ዐቀብ** “ascent” (عَقَبَة). *Tertiae gutturalis*: **የዋህ** “uprightness”, **ተላላ** “pectusculum”, but also **ገሀህ** “full-moon”; vowel-beginning roots: **ወሰን** “boundary”; *mediae infirmæ*: **ሀዩል** “stag”, **ደወል** “district”, **ጸወን** “castle”, (**አየር** “air” is a foreign word); *tertiæ infirmæ*: **መፀው** “Spring”, **ፈዐው** “viper”⁽¹⁾; but also with mixed sound: **ገበ** “side” (no doubt for **ገንቦ**; cf. **جَبَا**), **ፀክ** “hip” (perhaps for **ፀኩ**); from roots with final *i*, always with mixed sound: **ለፌ** “side”, **ሰፌ** “seam”, **ደፄ** “disease”, **ጎሌ** “song”. A *u*-containing guttural as first radical does not occur either here or in (፩).—Feminine forms in this formation are comparatively rare, § 127.

(፩) *The form with long ā in the second syllable and short ä in the first* is not common⁽²⁾: **በዓል** “festival”, **ሐሳብ** “reckoning”, **ሰላም** “peace”, **ረዓም** “thunder”, **ፈቃድ** “will”, **ገዳም** “field”⁽³⁾. *Mediae geminatae*: **ከባብ** “circle”; *mediae infirmæ*: **ሐዋይ** “gloom- ing”; *tertiæ infirmæ*: **ቀላይ** “abyss”; but with the **ው** rejected, when that is the last of the root (§ 53): **ጸጋ** “favour”, “grace”, **በዳ** “desert”⁽⁴⁾.

§ 108. 2. *Descriptive Words derived from the Perfect* (Verbal Adjectives and Participles). This family of words, still largely represented in Hebrew and Arabic, has been dying out in Ethiopic, (just as in Aramaic),—with the exception of the form employed for the Part. Pass. A periphrasis, effected by the Imperfect of the Verb, or in some other way, became more and more prevalent as a substitute for the Simple Adjective as well as for the Part. Act.; and the old Adjective-forms were given up.—Others have been retained merely because they have become Substantives. The original vowels of the Perfect are universally lengthened, to distinguish these words, as Nouns, from the Verb; and therefore

Descriptive
Words
derived as
Verbal Ad-
jectives and
Participles
from the
Perfect:

(1) **አፈው**, “sweet odours” and “sweet odour”, seems to be a Plural.

(2) In Arabic سَلَام, in Hebrew שָׁלוֹם, נְכוֹן.

(3) In the case of roots *tertiæ gutturalis* this formation cannot be distinguished from the preceding.

(4) Otherwise with Kōnig, p. 117.

the vowels \bar{i} and \bar{u} as well as \bar{a} are separately maintained, seeing that the long vowels \bar{i} and \bar{u} never lose their identity in e , though the short vowels \check{i} and \check{u} may do so.

With \bar{a} in
2nd Syllable.

(a) *The formation with \bar{a} in the second syllable* is now but weakly represented. The first syllable has \check{e} in the Adjective proper⁽¹⁾. These words have to some extent the signification of Participles. The following occur⁽²⁾: **አያው** “living”, **ኅዳጥ** “few” (if not originally “fewness”, § 107), **ዝላፍ** (= **ዝሉፍ**) “enduring”, **ዕረቅ** “naked” (if not a substantive, cf. § 156), **ጥራይ** (**ጥረ**) “raw”, **ንቃህ** “awaking”, **ኅዳግ** “abandoning”, **ሙቃሕ** = **ሙቁሕ** “fettered”, **ረኃጽ** “tender”, “delicate”, **ከያድ** “trodden down” Is. 18, 2 *var.*, **ጥራይ** “possessing” or “possessor” (Hen. 14, 6)⁽³⁾. But even these few adjectives, which are still in existence, have a marked leaning towards the Substantive use. They are not generally co-ordinated with a Substantive like pure Adjectives, but are placed in a more independent position, like a Substantive in apposition, and they sometimes subordinate themselves to Nouns in the Construct State, or complete themselves with a Suff.-pronoun.—Some words also which belong to this class, but have become pure Substantives, have been retained as a remnant from more ancient times, like **ሰማይ** (‘high’) “heavens”, **ፀሐይ** (‘glittering’) “sun”, (but often **ፀሐይ**), **ጽጋይ** “artificial flower”, perhaps also **ቀላይ** “abyss” (cf. § 107 *ad fin.*). Several also of the short words, mentioned in the end of § 105, belong at bottom to this formation.

With \bar{i} in
2nd Syllable.

(b) *The formation with \bar{i} in the second syllable* is more frequently employed for simple adjectives than any other: a number of these adjectives have become Substantives. This form comes oftenest from roots with an intransitive meaning⁽⁴⁾. More rarely the words concerned have a purely passive sense, and then the formation coincides with the one with \bar{u} ⁽⁵⁾. The first radical is given with \check{a} , to distinguish the words as Nouns proper from Participles; but in

(1) In Hebrew, **יָשָׁר** and **יָקָר**; in Arabic **طَوَال**, **جَبَان**, **حَسَن**.

(2) For the accentuation cf. TRUMPF, p. 534.

(3) **ሰናም** is not *gibbosus*, as LUDOLF thinks, but “hump” (**سَنَام**), § 107. [In Hen. 14, 6, FLEMMING adopts the reading **ጥራያህሙ**, while DILLMANN preferred **ጥራያ**. TR.]

(4) And then Hebrew adjectives like **יָגֵעַ** and **יָגִיעַ** answer to it.

(5) Like **פָּקִיד**.

the case of Roots *mediae gutturalis*, with *ě* (§ 45)⁽¹⁾. From strong roots: **ሐዲስ** “new”, **ረሴዕ** “godless”, **ቀጢን** “thin”, **ጎጲር** “short”, **ነኪር** “foreign”, **አዲም** “red”, **ጸሊም** “black”, **ገዢ** “thick”, **ፈጢን** “swift”, **በሊኅ** “sharp”; *mediae gutturalis*: **ርሐብ** “wide”, **ልሂቅ** “old”; *mediae geminatae*: **መሪር** “bitter”, **ቀሊል** “light”, **ዐዚዝ** “strong”, **ጠቢብ** “wise” (**ረቂቅ**, **ቁሪር**, **ጸቢብ**, **ደቂቅ**, § 136, 1, **ቁጢጥ**); *mediae infirmæ*: **ነዊኅ** “long” (and also, owing to the Aspirate, **ነዋኅ**, § 44), **ቀዩሕ** (*e. g.* Gen. 30, 35; and *Kebrā Nag.*, 12 b 11) and (§ 52) **ቀይሕ** “red”; from roots with final *ī*: **ዐበይ** “great”; in the case of roots with final *ū* this formation does not occur. Substantives: **ቀሰስ** “presbyter”, **ሐዲድ** “iron” (‘sharp’), **አሚር** “the first day of the month” (‘superior’), **ጸሪቅ** (‘thin’) “cake” and “small coin”, **ጠሊ** (§ 52) “goat” (**ጠጌ**), **ልሂቅ** and the common contracted form (§ 47) **ሊቅ** “elder”, “old man”, **ብሐሕ** “vinegar”; —farther, words originally possessing the force of a Part. Act., or forming an expression for the *Agent* ⁽²⁾: **ነቢይ** “prophet” (‘speaker’), **ሐቢ** (§ 52) “warranter” “manager”, **ቀሪም** “gleanings”, **ዐጲር** “juice pressed out”, **ጎጲን** “iron” (‘cutting’); or words with a passive sense: **አኒል** “dough” (§ 45), **መሲሕ** “Christ”. The forms which have **እ** prefixed (§ 34): **እግዚእ** “Lord” and **አክሊል** “garland”, “crown”, **اِكْلِيل** (**እኒኒይ**) come perhaps from Stem II, 1.

ስኒን *σχινος*, **ከሚን** *κύμινον* (where **ከ**=*κυ*) are foreign words.

(c) The formation with *ū* in the second syllable is by far the most common, and has still such force in the language that it may be derived from the majority of roots ⁽³⁾. It has first a strictly passive sense, and, when derived from verbs of Active signification, it serves as Passive participle, *e. g.* **ጽሑፍ** “written”. The first radical,—properly vowel-less, is always spoken with *ě*, (with the exception of **ደሙስ** “dark”). This comes about, partly in accordance with § 60, partly because this form, as being an expression of the Participle, stands close to the verb ⁽⁴⁾. It may also be de-

With *ū* in
2nd Syllable.

(¹) For the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 534.

(²) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 149, *e.*

(³) For the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 534.

(⁴) It answers completely to the Hebrew *Pa’ul*. When LUDOLF, ‘*Gr. Aethiop.*’ I, 3, maintains, that the second radical is doubled, he is evidently astray, and is as little to be relied upon as he proves himself otherwise to be in his statements about doubling:—For instance, he pronounces **ነገረ**, **ደነገር**

rived from roots, from which only Nouns are formed, *e. g.* **ሥዑር** “grassy”, **ልቡብ** “prudent”. It is even taken from Derived Stems; and,—as no other type is available, by which to form Passive Participles of such Stems, than that of the Pass. Part. of the Simple Ground-Stem,—it is taken according to that type, except that in the process the Derived Stems renounce their Stem-peculiarities, *e. g.* **ፍጹም** “complete”, “accomplished” (from *faṣṣáma*), **ሥቂይ** “tormented” (**ሣቀየ**), **ፍቂር** “beloved” (**አፍቀረ**, *Pass.* **ተፈቅረ**), **እኩት** “praised” (from **እእኩተ**), **ፍሠሕ** “delighted” (from **ተፈሥሐ** St. III, 2); but *cf.* § 111. From strong roots, as well as from Aspirate roots, Double-lettered, and Vowel-beginning roots, and from those which have a middle *i* or a final *i*, this type is similarly formed,—that is to say, strongly and fully: **ልሙድ** “learned”, **እሱር** “bound”, **ንሐል** “destroyed”, **ምሉእ** “full”, **ከተን** “condemned”, **ንዳይ** “impoverished”, **ምዩጥ** “turned away”. On the other hand from roots with final *ū*, in accordance with § 52, there emerges always the type **ልብው** *lebéwue* “skilled in”, **ዕልው** “apostate” &c.; from roots with middle *ū* the type **ምውት** *mewût* “dead” is possible certainly, and frequently occurs still; but in accordance with § 52, especially in later times, it usually passes into **ምውት** *méwwet*:—**ምውቅ** “warm”, **ምውእ** “conquered” &c. As is proved already by several of the examples which have been adduced, this type is formed not only from verbs of Active signification, but also from Intransitives; and in fact it is very frequently formed from the latter class of verbs, either with the force of a Participle, or directly as an Adjective: **ስኩብ** “lying”, **ሥፋር** “flying” (“occupied in flight”), **ርውጽ** “running”, **ሀልው** “existing”, **ርቡብ** “hovering”, **ውሩድ** “descending” G. Ad. 129, 26, **ጽቡእ** “engaged in a campaign”, **ምሉክ** “subjected”, **ጥቡዕ** “prepared” (intr. and pass.), **ጽወር** “laden”, **ሕሙም** “ill”, **ሕዙን** “sad”. It may even, like the Reflex-

naggára, *yenágger*, while he omits to notice that in forms like **ሰታይ**, § 110, the second radical is doubled. The Intensive forms **ሰጥጥ**, **ሰጥጥ**, **ሰጥጥ** &c. (EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 155, *d* and ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 248; HOFFMANN, ‘*Syr. Gramm.*’ p. 241; [and NÖLDEKE, ‘*Syr. Gr.*’ (*English Ed.*) p. 73]) are paralleled in Ethiopic rather by **ገባር**. The manner of formation of the Part. Pass. in the case of Verbal Stems externally increased, and Multiliteral roots (§ 111), tells decidedly against a doubling of the second radical, as also does the peculiar fashion of this formation in the case of roots *mediae infirmae*.

ive-Passive Stems, gain seemingly active meaning⁽¹⁾, e. g. **ጸኑሐ** (from **ጸንሐ** “to expect”) not “waited for”, but “engaged in waiting for” (‘lying-in-wait’), **ወኩል** “confiding in”, **ሰፍኖ** “given to evil-speaking”, “blasphemer”, **ደኑን** “safe and sound”, but also “wholesome” (G. Ad.), **እኑዝ**⁽²⁾ not only “kept a prisoner”, but also “clinging to”, i. e. “holdingsomething”, with Accusative (Hen. 56,1)⁽³⁾.

—In the great scarcity of simple adjectives, it has to supply Adjectives too, such as **ፖሉእ** “full” (and “filling up”), **ብዙኅ** “much”, **ሐሩሐ** “idle”, **ጸኑሐ** “strong”, **ጥቡሐ** “steadfast”, **ግፉም** “terrible”, **ደቡስ** “arid”, **ሐቁብ** “careful”, “heedful”, **ግፉሐ** “violent”, **ጥዩቅ** “sharp-sighted” &c. Substantives of this form are very rare: **ትጉህ** “watchful” and “watchman”, **ንጉሥ** “king”, **ሐድወ** “adversary” (ጃፈ), **ግዩር** “proselyte”, **ብሩር** “silver” (“white”), **ብሐእ** “leaven”, **ጸቡር** “muddy” and “mud”, **ጉኑድ** (from **ጉንድ**) “trunk” (of a tree), **ወጡን** “beginner”, “novice”. For a few Feminines v. § 128.

§ 109. 3. While the essential vowels in the Second Simple formation (*ā, ī, ū*) have been lengthened out of originally short vowels, as kindred languages show, a *Third series of Simple forms comes into being, by stronger vowels—or vowels which were long from the first—becoming established in the Stem*. To some extent they may be regarded as new and stronger forms derived from words of the Second series.

3. Third Formation:
—with Vowels long from the first.—

(a) *By the establishment of a long ā after the first radical*, which is followed by the appearance in the second syllable of the shorter vowel *ē* (§ 60), a type of word arises, of a strongly active sense, which signifies *the one who does* (the *Agents*), and which accordingly is employed in the other Semitic languages as Part. Act. of the First verbal Stem. In Ethiopic this form, however, can no longer be derived from every verb. It has almost died out, in fact, and is now represented by a few words only, which are used as Adjectives and Substantives, but not as Participles⁽⁴⁾. The follow-

With *ā* after 1st Radical (and *ē* after 2nd).

(1) Cf. EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ § 149, d; HOFFMANN, ‘Syr. Gramm.’ p. 177; EWALD, ‘Gr. Arab.’ § 244. [Cf. also NÖLDEKE, ‘Syr. Gr.’ (English Ed.) p. 223 sq. TR.]

(2) Like **በጥጥ** Cant. 3, 8.

(3) [FLEMMING reads here **ወደእኅዙ፡ መቅሠፍተ፡ ወመሣግረ** instead of DILLMANN’S **ወእኅዙ፡ መሣግረ**. TR.]

(4) For the accentuation cf. TRUMPP, p. 535.

ing still occur as Adjectives: **ጸድቅ** “just”, **ረታዕ** “straightforward”, “upright”, **ዳገገ** “sound and well”, (‘escaping unhurt’), **ባቀዕ** “useful”, **ባዕድ** “other”, “different”, **ላሕይ** “beautiful”.—As Substantives: **ኃጥእ** “sinner”, **ካህን** “priest”, **ሣውዕ** (‘sacrificer’) “idolatrous priest”, **ራድእ** “helper”, **ዋርስ** “heir”, **ቃውም** “sponsor”, “patron”, **ባዕል** “lord” and “rich”, **ላህም** “ox” (*cf.* **אֹיֶל**, **אֶפֶס**), **ማህው** “glass”, **ማይ** “water” (‘fluid’ $\sqrt{\text{מב}}$); and doubtless too those words in which (§ 105) a long \bar{a} has been shortened, like **አብድ** “foolish”, “fool”⁽¹⁾. This type is quite commonly employed in the formation of Numeral Adjectives, § 159.

With \bar{u}
or \bar{i} after
2nd Radical
(and a after
1st).

(b) In contrast with this form, of active meaning, effected by means of long \bar{a} , new and stronger forms arise, of conceptional words, by means of a long \bar{u} or \bar{i} , derived from the Passive vowel u or i , which has become established in the second syllable, and which is preceded in the first syllable not by the colourless \bar{e} , but by the more definite vowel a ⁽²⁾. This form is also very rare in Ethiopic⁽³⁾; with \bar{u} we have: **ሐሩር** “heat” (different from **ሐሩር** and **ሐራር**), **ሐጸር** “wall”, “defensive-work”, **ደቡብ** “North” (region of the **ደብ**); with \bar{i} : **ጎሪፍ** “the current year” (properly “Autumn”, the time in which fruits are ‘gathered’), perhaps **ጎሪፍ** “net” (with which one ‘sweeps together’) and **ዳቤር** with long \bar{a} , “the hinder space”, “*adytum*”, (of the Temple, **דְּבִיר**); and with an \bar{e} shaded out of \bar{i} : **ጋኔን** “spectre”, “evil spirit”, and a few Feminine Stems, § 127. But what is most important is, that this form is the one most usually employed in Ethiopic in the derivation of Verbal Abstracts or *Infinitives* from the several Verbal Stems, § 124,—which Infinitives only very seldom indeed are used as Noun-Substantives, like **አሚን** “belief”, **ውሐዝ** “river”.—For one or two Feminines v. § 127. A few Numeral-forms, having a inserted in their first syllable, make their appearance as new derivatives from Verbal Adjectives of the type **ግብር** (§ 107): v. § 159.

An additional number of words are to be found, apparently of simple formation, which cannot be explained from any of the usual word-types, and either depend upon obsolete formations or

(1) Also **ረውሕ** “placid” (v. LUDOLF, ‘*Lex.*’), if the reading is correct.

(2) For the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPF, p. 535.

(3) It occurs more frequently in Hebrew, EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 153.

upon a corrupt pronunciation of antique words, or words adopted from foreign languages. Examples of foreign words occur in

ዓለም “world”, “eternity”, عَالَم, עוֹלָם; ԸՊՊՊ “pomegranate”, رُْمَان; ሰከር “sugar”, سُكَّر; ጸላፅ “rock”, صُلْع or صُلَاع; ሰሜን “South”, تَيْمَن, تَيْمَن, ሲ.አ.ል, عَمَل, ነጻሃ; አቶን “oven”, أَثُون; ዲ.ባግ, دِيْبَاچ, ዲ.ናር, دِيْنَار “denarius”; ፈ.ቃር, فَقِيْ (‘mitra’);

አሜን, ስጽ; ቆብፅ (‘hood’), قُبْعَة, مُعْجَل, ጣዎስ, طَاوُس, τᾰῶς; ባለቅ and ባለቅ “marble”, بَلَق.—Words of obscure derivation and formation: ሢራይ “a costly garment”; ሆባይ “a kind of hawk”; ሣፀን “chest”, (‘ark’) “shrine”, (‘reliquary’); ቆባር “darkness”; ቆጶን “shoe”; ፈደል “letter of the Alphabet” (መሬት “earth”, “dust of the ground”; ብሔር “land”, “country”, “the earth”) and others.

2. NOMINAL STEMS FORMED BY DOUBLING OF RADICALS, OR FROM DERIVED VERBAL STEMS AND MULTILITERAL ROOTS.

§ 110. 1. *Formations from Simple Tri-radical Roots and Verbal Stems.*

1. From Simple Tri-rad. Verbal Stems: Attributive Words, formed by Doubling 2nd Rad., with tone-bearing *ā* after 2nd Rad. and *a* after 1st.

(a) *From simple tri-radical Verbal Stems, attributive words are formed by the doubling of the second radical,—which process here indicates the intensifying of the notion,—but in other respects, in accordance with the adjective-formation described in § 108. The first (closed) syllable invariably has the vowel *a*, the second the tone-bearing main vowel *ā*,—just as in § 108, (a) ⁽¹⁾. The other vowels, which are generally available for the formation of Adjectives (§ 108), and are also represented in the other Semitic languages ⁽²⁾, are wanting here in Ethiopic (unless it be that among the words cited in § 108 (b) & (c), a few have been admitted which have their middle radical doubled). To this formation belong, first of all, *Adjectives* which express qualities of a more intimate and firmly inherent nature, or properties possessed in a higher than usual proportion:—From strong roots: ፈረህ “timorous” (‘who is continually and easily frightened’), ረዥ “anxious” (G. Ad.), ጸገቅ “longing”, ተባፅ “masculine”, “manly”, ባሃም “dumb”, ባራሕ*

(¹) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 536.

(²) EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ § 155, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 248; HOFFMANN, ‘Syr. Gr.’, p. 241 sq. [V. NÖLDEKE, ‘Syr. Gr.’ (English Ed.) p. 71 sqq. TR.]

“bald”, **አዳም** “pleasant”, **ገሃድ** “manifest”;—*Denominatives*: **ጸገር** “hairy”, **ቁላፍ** (‘having the foreskin’) “uncircumcised”, **ቁጸል** “covered with foliage” (Deut. 12, 2).—From roots *mediae infirmæ*: **ጎያል** “strong”, “active”, **የዋህ** “meek”, **ሠያብ** “grey-headed”, **ጸያፍ** “stammering”, **ፀዋግ** “abominable”, “hateful”; *tertiæ infirmæ*: **ለዋው** “malignant”, **ከዋው** “energetic”, **ጠዋይ** “distorted”, **ሀክይ** “lazy”, **ነዳይ** “poor”, **ለሓይ** (together with **ላሕይ** § 109) “beautiful”, **ሠናይ** “beautiful”, “good”. And farther, this form serves also to express the ‘*doer*’ (‘who does anything frequently or continually’, —‘who does it as his occupation’ &c.):—**ገባር** “workman”, **ዐሳብ** “day-labourer”, **ፈላስ** “neighbour”, “foreign resident” (‘metic’), **ሰታይ** “drinker”, **ዘማ** (§ 53) “whoremonger”, “whore”; from **እግር** “foot” **አጋር** “pedestrian”. The most of the words which have this meaning assume farther the extraneous termination *ī* (§ 117); several have even both forms: **ጸራብ** and **ጸራቢ** “carpenter”, **ሐዳፍ** and **ሐዳፊ** “steersman”; from **ሐቅል** “field” **ሐቃል** and **ሐቃሊ** “a countryman”.

Adjectives formed by Reduplication of both the last Rad., with *ī* (or *ā*) in the last Syllable and *a* in the other two.

(b) *A still more vigorous reduplication,—that of both the last radicals,—is employed, just as in Verbal Stems (§ 77), for the derivation of Adjectives from roots which denote colours and savoury things, in order to indicate resemblance thereby*(¹): The last and main syllable has *ī* (perhaps also *ā*); the other two have *a*, just as in § 108, (b) (²): **ጸዕድሂድ** “whitish”, **መዐርሂር** (also, in abbreviated form, **መዓሪር**) “like honey”, *i. e.* “sweet”, **ጎመልሚል** “green”, **አበድቢድ** “foolish”, **ደመንሚን** “very gloomy”, **ሐዘንዚን** “mournful”, **መንጠንጢን** “small”, **ዐጸብጸብ** “very hard”, **ደበርበር** “back-prop” (also “*supinus*”, v. Gloss.). The only Feminine forms as yet known are **ቀያሕይሕት** “reddish” (doubtless from **ቀያሕይሕ** § 36), and **በራሕርሕት** “glittering” (from **በራሕሪሕ** or **በራሕራሕ**).

2. From Derived Verbal Stems:—Conceptional Words:—Ground-Stem, with *a* after 2nd Rad., and strongly accented Fem.-ending *ā*.

§ 111. 2. *Formations from Derived Verbal Stems.* Several of the Nominal forms described in §§ 105—109 belong to these formations, and at the same time retain the peculiarities of the Stems from which they are produced. Of course the First Simple formation (§ 105) is entirely wanting in such Derivatives; for the one vowel after the first radical would not suffice to sustain these longer Stems. But the forms given in §§ 106—108 may more or less repeat themselves in this Class.

(¹) Exactly as in Hebrew: EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 157, c.

(²) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 536.

(a) *Conceptional words from Derived Stems* exhibit different forms according to the Stems from which they come. (α) *From the Second Ground-Stem* (I, 2) conceptional words of an Infinitive-character are formed by means of *a* after the second radical, and the Feminine-ending *ā* strongly accented⁽¹⁾, which at the same time generally prevents the lengthening of the foregoing formative *a*. The first syllable,—a closed one,—is also pronounced with *a*⁽²⁾. This form, however, is no longer very common: መከራ “temptation”, ቀበላ “meeting”, ዘለፋ “correction”, አበላ “transgression”, ዐመፃ “injustice”, (‘wrongdoing’), ዐጸበ “distress” (‘a making difficult’), መዐዛ “odour”; and in like manner from several roots not in use as Verbs in Stem I, 2: ሐተታ “judicial investigation” (‘cognitio’), ጎሣሣ “inquiry”, ነከራ “wonder”, “miracle”; perhaps also some Names of things:—like ቀጸላ “crown”, “garland”, ከወላ and ከዋላ—[for a form ኳላ v. *Kebra Nag.* p. XXX a] “rear”, “hinder part”, ገጸላ “carcase” (‘a stretching out’), ጸመና “cloud” (‘a veiling’). Several others among the Intensive Stems have given up this troublesome formation, and have reverted to the form of *Nomina Actionis* which is described in § 106, but have assumed the heavy feminine-ending *ā*, by way of distinction from the forms taken from the Simple Stem: ንስሐ “penitence”, ፍሥሐ “joy”, ቀላጥዓ “displeasure”, ፍግዓ “pleasure”, ሕልያ “faculty of thinking”, “intellect”, ውውዓ “clamour”, ጉጉኣ “zeal”, “haste”, ምምዓ “consternation”; instead of ምልኣ “taste”, Deut. 32, 28, the majority of manuscripts have ምልሕ. Quite isolated stand ጽውዕ *ṣéwwe* “invitation”, and የውሀት *yáwwehat* “mildness”⁽³⁾. From Causative Stems also, the Abstract-formation with *a* after the second-last radical, and with the feminine-ending *ā*, was no doubt at one time in greater use, but in ordinary Ethiopic it is now retained only in አርአያ (‘to show’) “example”, “form” (and perhaps in አስትዓ “donation”).

(1) Cf. TRUMPP, p. 536.

(2) These forms are paralleled with tolerable exactness by the Aramaic Infinitives of the Pael and other Stems (ܐܬܝܬܐ &c.) as well as by Hebrew words like אָתָּן. EWALD § 156, d.

(3) ጸሎት “prayer”, inherited from older times, is the Arabic صَلَوة; in Ethiopic we say ጸለየ “to pray”, not ጸለወ.

From
Reflexive-
Passive
Stems; with
ā after 2nd
Rad., the 1st
Syllable
being
formed by
ta closed
by 1st Rad.

(β) *From Reflexive-Passive Stems* formed by prefixing **ተ**⁽¹⁾, the *Nomen actionis* was once capable of being formed from the Subjunctive, retaining at the same time the vowels of that mood⁽²⁾; but this formation has died out. The only forms still known are **ተመሀር** *tamāhhar* “study”, and, from Multiliteral roots in like manner: **ተንበል** (‘mediation’) “mediator”, **ተንከተም** (‘covering over’) “bridge”. On the other hand the type with long *ā* after the second radical, before which **ተ** retains its *a* and attracts the first radical to its syllable, is very common, but it is formed only from St. III, 1, to which also St. III, 2 has to be transferred. It is in this fashion that Conceptional words of a Passive sense, which may also be Names of things, are expressed⁽³⁾: **ተዝካር** “remembrance”, **ተግባር** “performance” (‘work’, ‘deeds’), **ተፋጸም** “completion”, **ተስፋሕ** “delay”, **ተጽራሕ** “floor or story (of a house)”, **ተሥላስ** “third-floor”, **ታኅማስ** “quintupling”, “number five”; *mediae geminatae*: **ተጥብብ** “astuteness”, **ተድብብ** (‘crowning’) “pinnacle”; Vowel-beginning: **ተውሳክ** “addition”, **ተውላጥ** “exchange”, **ተውዳስ** “praising”; *mediae infirmæ*: **ተምያጥ** “alteration”, **ተምያን** “fraud”, **ተቅዋም** (‘setting up’) “basis”, “framework”; from Roots with final *u* we have, it is true, **ተብቃው** “gaping”, “ajar”, but as a rule the **ው** is thrown off⁽⁴⁾: **ታሕማ** “affinity”, **ታእኃ** “fraternity”, “relationship”, **ተስፋ** “hope”, **ተድላ** “dignity” *ጥሥቀኝ*; from Roots with final *i*, only the feminine form **ተውኔት** “orgies” (for **ተውኔይት** or **ተውናይት**) is as yet known. Sometimes the *a* of the first syllable elevates itself⁽⁵⁾ into *e*, especially in names of things: **ትእዛዝ** “command”, **ትርእስ** “what lies at the head” (“bolster”, 1 Sam. 26, 7, 11), **ትርጋሐ** “what lies about the feet”, (and perhaps **ትንፋግ** “wetness of the ground”, “marshy quality of the soil”, *uligo*, and **ትንታግ** “firebrand”), also **ትንበል** “mediation” (from

(¹) According to PRAETORIUS, ‘*Beitr. z. Ass.*’ I, p. 38 *sqq.*, these Nominal types, formed with *t* prefixed, should rather be assigned to the Intensive Stem. Cf. also KÖNIG, p. 81.

(²) Like **تَقَبَّلَ**.

(³) [A comparison with similar formations in Assyrian makes it highly probable, however, that these nouns have nothing whatever to do with the Verbal Stems III, 1 or III, 2.]

(⁴) Like **تَلَقَّاهُ** EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 280.

(⁵) Cf. KÖNIG, p. 123.

ተንበል).—*Nomina actionis* are very seldom formed from other verbal Stems in this way, with long *ā* in the last syllable: from St. IV, 1 comes **አስተንፋስ** “breathing”; from St. I, 3 (in accordance with § 60) **ሱታፍ** “participation”, or **ፋኬብ** (Ex. 36, 31) “fastening together”⁽¹⁾ (with *ē* shaded out of *ā*); but generally such forms from St. I, 3, as well as from I, 2, III, 3 and IV, 3, have in addition an external ending (v. § 120).

In the formations, however, which come from Passive Stems,—as we see in Hebrew and Syriac⁽²⁾ particularly,—the Passive vowels *ū* and *ī* were also permissible. In Ethiopic it is the Subject of the Passive proceeding, rather than the proceeding itself, which is expressed by this method,—so that this form has much more to do with Qualifying-words: **ተብሏል** and **ትብሏል** “what is cooked”, “dish” or “mess” (Gen. 25, 29—34); **ተልሚድ** “disciple” (probably a foreign word). But the intimately attached Feminine termination **ት** is usually associated with it⁽³⁾, before which, in accordance with § 36, *ī* or *ū* is shortened into *é*. In this way a new class of Abstract Nouns and Names of things is derived. In the first syllable *a* was originally kept up (e. g. in **ተፍሥሕት** Gen. 31, 27 F, **ተውልድ** Gen. Comm. p. 5, **ተግብርት** Amos 8, 6 A, **ተምወእት** 4 Kings 13, 17, **ተውፊት** as well as **ትውፊት** “tradition”), but in later times it was universally thickened into *e*, before the *é* of the second syllable. The form is pretty common, v. for instance **ትግብርት** “production” (G. Ad., as from **ተግብር** “what is produced”) *tegbért*⁽⁴⁾, **ትሕርምት** “abstinence”, **ትምህርት** “doctrine”, **ትምልክት** “principality”, **ትፍሥሕት** “enjoyment”, **ትግሕሥት** “divergence”, **ትዕግልት** “fraud”, **ትግዕርት** “lamentation”, **ትስብእት** “assumption of human nature”, **ትዝምድ** *tezméd* (§ 54) “race”, “family”; particularly from Numerals, like **ትሥልስት** “what is threefold, Trinity” (“tripling”), and others, § 159; Vowel-beginning: **ትውክልት** and **ቱክልት** “trust”, **ትውልድ** (§ 54) and **ቱልድ** (Gen. 15, 2 F) “race” (pronounce *tewléd* or *tüléd*)⁽⁵⁾; *mediae in-*

(1) Quite peculiar is **ዋክ** “lustre” (from **ዋከዩ**), as well as **ላኳ** “strife” (**ተላከዩ**).

(2) V. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 161, *a*; HOFFMANN, p. 243. [Cf. also NÖLDEKE ‘*Syr. Gramm.*’ (English Ed.) p. 76. TR.]

(3) Somewhat as in **ጠጃጃት**, **ሰላላት** &c.

(4) On the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 536.

(5) Although LUDOLF I, 5 tells us to say *tewéld*.

firmae: ትዕይርት “aspersion”, ትዝውፍት “self-conceit”, ትምይንት “wiles”, ትዕይንት “camp”; *tertiæ infirmæ* (in accordance with § 51): ትንቢት “prophecy”, ትርሲት “ornament”, ትእሲት “dross”, ትዕቢት “pride”, ትሥጉት “incarnation”.

Qualifying
or
Descriptive
Words from
Derived
Stems; with
ū after 2nd
Rad.

(b) *Qualifying* or *Descriptive words* from the derived Stems are upon the whole of rare occurrence:—the majority of Participles and those words which stand for them are derived by means of external prefixes and suffixes (§§ 114 and 117). But the Passive-Participle formation, with *ū* after the second radical (§ 108, c), besides its use in the first Stem, is at least admissible in several of the other Active Stems and is very common in the case of St. I, 3⁽¹⁾. From Stem IV, 1 we meet with እስትርኩብ “absorbed in a matter”, and from IV, 3 እስትጉብእ “gathered together”, in which the foregoing *a* of the Perfect Stem is in this manner reduced to *ě*, and,—in accordance with §§ 18 and 78,—*ā* to *ū*. Following the last rule St. I, 3 produces ቡሩክ “blessed”, ሰሩር “founded”, ሰቱፍ “sharing in”, ሉጹይ “shaven”, ጉብእ “gathered together”, ሐቡር “coloured”, ኑፋቅ “unbelieving”, “doubting” (but also ሥቂይ, in accordance with § 108 c).—ንጽብሩቅ “transparent” (*V* በረቀ, cf. *supra* p. 135 sq, and *infra* p. 238) may also be referred to this class.

3. From
Multiliteral
Roots:—
Simple
Conceptional
Words
and Names
of Things.—

§ 112. 3. *Multiliteral Roots* are, for the most part, formed into Substantives only, rarely into qualifying words. Farther those Substantives are mostly names of things, seldom conceptional words. The feminine-ending (except the ending *ā*, § 127) is rarely attached to these formations, already rather lengthy. A large number of Multiliteral Nouns have been imported from foreign sources, or else have an origin which remains obscure.

(a) *Simple Conceptional words* and *Names of things*, derived from Quadriliteral Roots, are formed for the most part in such a way that each pair of radicals is brought into one syllable. A like process is followed in the case of Quinqueliteral Roots, the first radical being attached by way of prefix in front of the first complete syllable. When a long formative vowel is inserted, it bears the tone; but when only short vowels are used, according to the later pronunciation, the tone falls on the first closed syllable. (α) *When both syllables have short ě* ⁽²⁾ (so that the word answers

(1) On the accentuation cf. TRUMPP, p. 536.

(2) In ከኩሕ “stone”, “rock”, the *a* of the first syllable seems to

somewhat to the form **ግብር**, § 105):—**ብድብድ** “plague”⁽¹⁾, **ንፍ** **ንፍ** “drizzle”, **ቀስቀስ** “furniture”, **ቀንጽል** “fox”, **ቀንፍዝ** “hedgehog”, **ድንግል** “virgin”, **ድስከን** *τραγέλαφος* (Deut. 14, 5), **ብርስን** “lentils”, **ጽንጉን** “mud-heap”.—A conceptional word of this form is **ውልውል** “perturbation”. *Quinqueliteral*: **ድቀንድቀ** “axe”, **ድልቅልቅ** “violent agitation” (‘earthquake’) “quaking”, **ድብዕ** **ኩል**, **ደብዕኩል** and **ድንብዕኩል** “den” or “cage”.—Foreign word: **ድርህም** “dirhem”. (β) *When both syllables have short ä: ሐም ሐም* “gourd”, **ፀፍፀፍ** “pavement”, **ጐዝጐዝ** “carpet”, **ቀልቀል** “precipice”, **ሐዝሐዝ** “pool”, **ዓምዓም** “pool” (probably written with long *ā*, merely in error, § 48), **ሰውሰው** “ladder”, **ሠቅሠቅ** “network”, **ቂስቂስ** = **ቀስቀስ**, **በርበር** “booty”, **ሰንሰል** “chain”, **ቀልደድ** (“eyebrow”) “orbit of the eye”, **ሐንዘር** “hog” (Hen. 89, 10), **ከንበል** “hair-comb”, **ሐንገዝ** “eyebrows”, **ቂንዝእ** “lock (of hair)”, **ከንፈር** “lip”, **ዐንበር** “sea-monster”, **ተንከር** “topaz”, **ቀርነብ** “eyelash”, **ሐርገጽ** “crocodile”, **ከርከዕ** “almond-nut”, **ሰውተል** “javelin”, **ዐይንን** “tub”, (“pitcher”) (**يَجَانَة**), **ወይጦል** *δόρκας*, **ሃይከል** *ካን*,

When both Syllables have short ä.

When both Syllables have short ä.

[from the Assyrian *ikallu*, Sumerian *e-gal*,] **መቀዑል** “fat”, **ኮከብ** “star”. A conceptional word of this type is **መርሰስ** “feeling”, “groping”. To this division farther belong, according to § 71:—

ሰሰን “lasciviousness”, **ደደክ** “frost”, **ቀቀብ** “scabbard”. (γ) *When the last syllable has ā, and the first either ä or ē:—ዐቅራብ* **ዐቅራብ** “scorpion”, **ሰግላጥ** “a costly garment” (**سِكْلَات**), **ሰይጣን**

When the last Syllable has ā, and the first either ä or ē.

(**شَيْطَان**), “Satan”, **ቶታን** “shoe-tie”, **ቂቃሕ** “flour”, **ሕንባል** “saddle for a camel”, **ሕንባብ** “berry”, **ክርዳድ** “weed” (Matt. 13, 25), **ኩርናዕ** “elbow”, **ድንባዝ** “beam”, **ድንጋግ** “margin”, **ግንፋል** “brick”, **ጽንሓሕ** “burnt-offering”; **ዕጉስታር** “absinth”, **ድምድማ** (§ 47) “hair of the head”, **ቀስቋስ** = **ቀስቀስ**, **ክርታስ** “charta”.

Words of obscure formation and origin are met with in **ባሕሩስ** “reed-pen”, **አንጼዋ** “mouse”, **ዶርህ** “cock”, **ጸናታም** “rue”, **በሊኖን** “veil”, **ቀለምጽጽ** “spark”.—Foreign words: **ምሥጦር** *μυστήριον*, **ቀንዲል** “candela”, **ፍንዱቅ** *πανδοχείον*, **ዐንጉግ** *σαῦρα*, **عَنْجُور** &c.

occur by way of compensation for an Aspirate (**ኩሕኩሕ** cf. *supra* p. 133); but cf. PRAETORIUS, *Amh. Spr.*, p. 152.

(1) On the accentuation cf. TRUMPF, p. 536 sq.

Descriptive
Words, and
Substantives
derived
from them.

(b) *Descriptive (or Qualifying) Words, and Substantives derived from them.* The Quadriliteral Verbal Stem is employed in its readiest dissyllabic pronunciation, viz. with two short *a*'s, as a qualifying word; or else,—when it has to be more exactly distinguished as an Adjective,—an *a* establishes itself after the second radical also, and the word becomes a trisyllable⁽¹⁾: **ሰንገግ** “firm”, “massive”, (**زَنِيَق**), **ደገደገ** and **ደገደገ** “lean” (Gen. 41, 4 *sqq.*), **ከሠከሥ** “speckled” (Gen. 30, 32—39; 31, 10—12, in later manuscripts **ከሳከሰ**); **ጉፃጉሶ** “rugged”. Or otherwise, the last syllable takes a lengthened *ā*, and the first is then pronounced either with *e* (as in § 108 *a*): **ድክታም** “bereaved of parents” (= **ድክቱም**), or more frequently with *a* (as in § 110, 1 *a*): **ሐንካስ** “lame”, **ጸምላጥ** “blear-eyed”, **ላእላእ** (Constr. St. **ላእላእ**) “stammering”; and with final *u* discarded (§ 53) **ጸዕዳ** or **ጸዐዳ** “white”. **እንስሳ** (discarding the **ው**, § 53) “four-footed animal” (“going on four feet”)⁽²⁾ has become entirely substantive. The most common of these forms is that of the Passive Participle, with *ū* in the last syllable (§§ 108 and 111, *b*), before which the preceding syllables retain the shortest possible vowel: **ልምሉም** “tender”, **ሕርቱም** “unfortunate”, **ሕብቁቅ** “stained”, **ምዝቡር** and **መዝቡር** “destroyed” (**ሕብሩት**, **ምሕፁን**, **ግበሱስ**, **ጉንዱይ**, **ሥእሠእ**, **ፍልሱፍ**), **ውልዉል** “unstable”, **ዝንጉግ** “derided” (from **ዘንጉግ**); from roots with long vowel as second radical (§ 20):—**ሙሱን** “corrupted” (**ማሰነ**), **ሙቁሕ** “captive” (**ሞቅሐ**), **ቱሱሕ** “mixed” (**ቶስሐ**), **ጊጉይ** “erring” (**ጊገየ**), **ቂቂይ** “avaricious”, **ሊሉይ** “separated”; from roots with *u* as last radical (§ 52): **ውርዝው** “young”, **ምንስው** “tempted”, **ስንእው** “agreeing” (**ውልትው**, **ምንትው**, **አጎርው**), **ጽዕድው** “bleached”, “white”; with *i*:—**ጉዕቱይ** “deluded”. This Participle may also be derived from the Reflexive Stem V, sometimes in the form **እንፍርዑጽ** “dancing”, **እንጠሉሶ** “veiled”, **እንጉግው** “erring”, **እንቅዕድው** “devout”; sometimes discarding the initial **እ** (§ 87):—**ንጽብሩቅ** “transparent”, **ንቅጥቁጥ** (G. Ad.) “delirious”, **ንዝሀሉል** and **እንዝሀሉል** “dissolute”; and with still more marked abbreviation: **ንኩል** “giddy” (from **አንኮለለ**). Some-

(1) On the accentuation cf. TRUMPP, p. 537.

(2) [Probably to be compared with **סִסִּי**; **לִסְסִי**, **סִסְסִי**; and, it may be, with Assy. *sīsū* (although the *i* there cannot yet be proved to be long); v. LITTMANN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assy.*’ XIII, p. 155, N. 1.]

times these formations assume the meaning of Substantives:—**ፍርፋር** “crumb”, **ሰንበ-አ** “lung”, **አንጌጋይ** “aberration”; fem. **ድርድር** “hinge of a door”.—The form with *i* (v. § 110, *b*) is preserved in a few Verbals only, which have taken a Substantive colouring:—**ለጸሊጽ** “the index of a balance”, **ነፍኒፍ** “drizzle”, **ከንፊፍ** “border”, **ሰንበል** “spikenard”⁽¹⁾, **ነህሊል** and **ነዝህሊል** “dissolute”, “a debauchee” (*V*ህሊል).

(*c*) *Stronger Conceptional Words (Nomina Actionis) arise from Multiliteral Roots, having long ā in the last syllable* (cf. § 111, *a*, *β*) and *a* in the preceding one: **ጌጋይ** “sin”, **ሰብሳብ** “marriage” (*V*ቃ from repeated cohabitation), **ሠብሣብ** “trellis”, “basket-work, or lattice-work”, **ሣእሣእ** “eloquence” (**ወሥኦ**), **ዓእዓእ** “shoots” (**ወፅኦ**,—**ወፃፃፃፃ** ‘descendants’), **ጸሕጸሕ** “dropping”, **ከሙሳስ** “mild gravity”, **ከብካብ** “marriage-feast”, **ፈድፋድ** “excess”, **ለፕሳስ** “soft whispering”, **ነጸፍጸፍ** and **ነጠብጠብ** “drops”, **ሐመልማል** “greenness”, **ገበጥጥ** and **ግበጥጥ** “colic” (*Kuf.*); from one or two Causative Stems (§ 85), discarding **አ**:—**ሰቆራር** “horror”, **ሰዖዛዝ** “spasm”, **ሰቆቃው** “lamentation”; and frequently from Reflexive Stem V, discarding **አ**:—**ነጐድጓድ** “thunder”, **ነኩርኳር** “whirlpool”, **ነጐርጓር** “murmuring”; **ነፈርዓጽ** “wantonness”, **ነጸብራቅ** “brilliance”, **ነጎጋው** “hesitation” (**ነሶሳው**, **ነቀልቃል**, **ነቀጥቃጥ**, **ነበልባል**, **ነላላል**, **ነገርጋር**, **ነህላል**); also **አንጉጋው** “aberration”; more rarely with the pronunciation **ንበስበስ** “tremulous movement”, **ንዝህላል** “buffoonery”, **ንስሕሳሕ** “motion”; as also from the Simple Stem: **ሲሳይ** “food”, **ለላይ** “separation”.

Stronger
Conception-
al Words
(*Nomina
Actionis*);
with *ā* in
the last
Syllable,
and *a* in
the preced-
ing one.

3. NOMINAL STEMS OF OUTER FORMATION.

(*a*) *Forms reached by means of Prefixes.*

§ 113. The formation, employed in Verbs and associated with the Imperfect, which is effected by prefixing *ye* or *ya*, was at one time extensively used in Nouns, particularly in Minao-Sabaic, but also in the other Semitic tongues⁽²⁾. In Ethiopic it has died out entirely, and is now represented by a single word only, handed down from remote antiquity, viz. **ይርባሕ** or **ያርባሕ** (*yā* lengthened by the tone, for *ya*) “giant” (root **ከጋገ**, **ረብሐ**). In the same way

With the
Prefix **ኦ**.

(1) **ዎስኪን** “poor” is a foreign word.

(2) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 162, *a*; ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 281. DIETRICH, ‘*Abh. zur hebr. Gramm.*’ p. 140 sqq.

the formation of Adjectives,—with the force of Intensives and Elatives,—which has come into wide-spread use especially in Arabic⁽¹⁾, effected by prefixing **h**, was evidently at one time existent in Ethiopic; but, except for some scanty remains, it has wholly disappeared. The following appear still, viz.⁽²⁾:—**hንဂဝ** “tear” (‘flowing’), **hንጉዕ** “marrow” (properly, ‘the best’ or ‘purest’; cf. **نَفَى**), **hዝዩ** and **hዜ** (§ 40) “the South” (**أَزَب**), **hዝመር** “purple” (**أَسْمَر**), **hስፈር** (Deut. 28, 22, **أَصْفَر**)⁽³⁾ ‘a malady’, probably of ‘the liver’, with which is to be compared **ዘፍራ** “yellow colour”, as a fem. from **أَصْفَر**, and in like manner, perhaps, **ዘብዳ** “skin” (root **سَبَد**), because the plural runs **ዘበድው**. And farther, this form perhaps includes **hንቀጽ** “door” (‘being ajar’, ‘gaping’, from **نَقَصَ**, unless it is rather to be derived from **قَصَّ** VII “to come by a crack or hole”). The words **hስካል** “cluster of grapes” (**أَشْكَال**) and **hጽባዕት** “finger” (**أَصْبَع**) are very old⁽⁴⁾. **hርዮ** “the name of a planet” is a foreign word; **hንቃል** “louse” is merely a dialectic variety of **ቀማል**;—**hርዑት** “yoke” is **أَرْعُوة**⁽⁵⁾. [Also **hስሐትያ**, **hስሐቲያ** “hail”, “cold” probably belongs to these formations]⁽⁶⁾.

Forms with **ተ** prefixed are, in accordance with § 111, systematically derived from Reflexive-Passive Stems⁽⁷⁾.

On the other hand the prefix *ma*, largely employed in all Semitic languages, in the sense of “he who” or “that which” (from the Interrogative Root, § 63), is very extensively made use of in Ethiopic also, in the derivation of verbal forms, and especially Participles, together with Adjectives and Substantives which resemble Participles.

1. First of all, this *ma* is employed in the formation of *Participles*, which then are farther made use of (just like those described in § 109, a) partly as Adjectives, or oftener as words which indi-

(1) EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 251 sq.

(2) For the accentuation cf. TRUMPF, p. 537.

(3) [For **ص** = **h** cf. LITTMANN, ‘Zeitschr. f. Assyrl.’ XIV p. 84, Note 1.]

(4) On these cf. EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ § 147, b.

(5) Cf. EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 243.

(6) [Cf. DILLMANN, ‘Lex.’, col. 331.]

(7) [But v. p. 234, Note (3).]

cate Persons. But Participles of this sort, formed with *ma*, are never derived from the Simple Ground-Stem, (the Inner-formation being found sufficient in the case of that Stem, in accordance with § 108 sq.)⁽¹⁾, but only from the Derived Stems, and of these again, only from the Active Stems, not from the Reflexive or Passive. The latter, in forming their Participles, avail themselves of the type described in § 117. From the Active Stems themselves an Active Participle only is derived. Such a Participle is still very common, but Passive Participles here are seldom met with. This formation, however, is no longer by any means so vigorous as to make its appearance in the case of every Active verbal Stem. It is only in the case of a few Stems of certain verbs that Verbal forms, reached in this way, have continued to maintain themselves in the language, just like the Participles of the Simple Ground-Stem. As regards the method of formation, the formative prefix is invariably uttered with *a*, thus—*ma*; and this *a* holds such an undisputed sway, that even in foreign words, of Arabic origin, the Arabic *ʾ* is replaced by *ma*,—as in *መሐመድ* “Muhammad”, *መስላም* “Muslim”, *መዘየን* *مُزَيِّن*, (by *ም*, however, in *አልምዕትዝላ* *الْبُعْتَرَكَة*). *ma* is always applied to the beginning of the Stem, exactly like the Causative *h*; and the latter is put aside, without a trace left, whenever *ma* has to go in front, and then *ma* takes its place. Just as it is with the Subjunctive and Imperfect forms of these Stems, the last syllable in the Active Participle has the vowel *e*, and in the Passive the vowel *a*. And farther, the Adjective-ending *i* may also be attached to such Participial formations; cf. *infr.* § 118.

§ 114. (a) From Stem I, 2 come, for example⁽²⁾:—*መዐምሕ* Participial formation with *ma*:— (*maʾammes*) “he who acts unjustly”, *መፈክር* “interpreter”, *መረብሐ* “he who makes four persons in the Godhead”, *መገሥድ* “castigator”; — *mediae gutturalis*:—*መምህር* (*maméhher*) “teacher” (§ 45); *mediae geminatae*:—*መከንን* “judge”, *መሐልል* “dealer in unguents”; *mediae infirmæ*:—*መሰውር* (*masáwwer*) “protector”, *መፈውስ* “physician”; *tertiæ infirmæ*: *መሠርይ* and *መሠሪ* From St. I, 2.

⁽¹⁾ I am not able to admit the objections raised by PRAETORIUS, ‘*Amh. Spr.*’ p. 158: *መንክስ* “young” is actually a Substantive=“something small”.

⁽²⁾ For the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 537 sq.

“magician”, **መጸገው** “he who bestows”, **መሰጥው** “he who accepts” (§ 51). These forms also occur occasionally from roots which are not in use as Verbs in St. I, 2, like **መከልክ** “hinderer”. A Substantive formed in this way is **መጠብቅ** “glue” (‘causing to adhere’); **መሠንዶ** “the best” (of a thing) is commonly used as a neuter.

From
St. I, 3.

(b) From St. I, 3 come, for example,—**መዓትም** “quarrelsome”, “passionate”, (*cf.* عتب III)⁽¹⁾; **መናፍቅ** “heretical”; **መናዝዝ** “consoling”; **መጸዕን** “horseman” (Deut. 20, 1); **መናህይ** “comforting”; **መባኪ** “bewailing” (Matt. 9, 23). In **መሃፒል** “ful-
ler” the short *e* has been lengthened into *i*.

From
St. II, 1.

(c) From St. II, 1 this form is pretty common:—**መጥምቅ** “Baptist”; **መድኅን** “Redeemer”; **መስፍን** “prince”, “chief”; **መርዕድ** “terrible” (‘causing to tremble’); **መሥዕር** “grassy”, “producing grass”; **መብክክ** “rugged”, “stony ground”; **መጽልም** “dark”, “a dark place”, &c.;—*primae gutturalis*: **ማእምር** “acquainted with”;—*mediae geminatae*: **መድምም** “astounding” (‘causing astonishment’); **መዕርር** “a mischief-maker” (‘one who stirs up discord’);—*tertia infirmæ*: **መድልው** “hypocrite” (also **መደልው** St. I, 2); **መጥዕይ** “physician” (‘healer’); **መፍርይ** “fruitful”, **መኩሲ** (and **መኩስይ**) “having the same name”. **ማሪ** “a heathen seer” is a curiously shortened form, from **መርኢ**⁽²⁾ (§ 47).

From
St. II, 2.

(d) From St. II, 2 these formations are rare; besides, they coincide in outward form with those which are derived from St. I, 2, *e. g.* **መጸብሕ** “tax-gatherer”; **መለብው** “teacher”; **መሠንዶ** “beautifier”.

From
St. IV, 1, 2, 3.

(e) The Reflexive Stems do not form this Participle: they may form their participles in another way (§ 117), or may pass into the Causative-Reflexive type and then adopt Participles belonging thereto. But the form is in frequent use from St. IV, 1, 2, 3. From the Perfect-form of St. IV, 1, **አስተርሐቀ**:—**መስተምሕር** “he who craves mercy for any one” (‘intercessor’); **መስተብቀኑ** “beseeching urgently”; **መስተስርይ** “he who implores forgiveness”. From the type of the Perfect **አስተረሐቀ**:—**መስተመይጥ** “one who is prone to change his mind” (**ተመይጦ** ‘to face about’); **መስተኅሥሥ** “inventor”. From St. IV, 2: **መስተዐግሥ** “patient”;

(1) V., on the other hand, PRAETORIUS, ‘Beitr. z. Ass.’ I, p. 25 sq.

(2) [V., however, DILLMANN, ‘Lex.’, col. 168.]

መስተበቅል “avenger”; **መስተዐግል** “a fraudulent person”; **መስተጢይር** “augur” (**ተጢየረ**);—*mediae gutturalis*: **መስተጽዕን** “horseman”, “knight” (**ተጽዕነ**). From St. IV, 3: **መስተሣህል** “easy to be entreated”; **መስተሳልም** “peacemaker”; **መስተሓምም** “anxious”, “troubled about anything”; **መስተሳልቅ** “mock” (**ተሳለቀ**); **መስተቃይም** “vindictive”; **መስተዋድይ** “accuser” or **መስተዋኒ** “actor”, “player”.

(f) This Participle is also formed by the Active Stems of *Multiliteral Roots*. From St. I,—which, in the construction of its syllables, corresponds to a St. I, 2 of the tri-radical roots,—come **መቤዝው** “one who ransoms”, “redeemer”; **መተርጉም** “interpreter”; **መጠንቀላ** “soothsayer”; **መጉንድይ** “delaying”⁽¹⁾. From St. II:—**መደንግሪ** “terror-inspiring”; **መማዕልይ** “tyrant” (from **አማዕለየ**, **ማዕሌት**, **ዐለየ**); or **መስዖዝዝ** “who or what causes numbness or stupor”, “stupefying”; **መንጎግው** “vagabond”; **መስቆቅው**⁽²⁾ “one who chants a dirge”. Also there occurs from the Weak Reflexive St. V, **መንጉርጉር** “murmurer”.

From
Active
Stems of
Multiliteral
Verbs.

Along with these pretty common Active Participles, a few cases also are met with,—though it is but rarely,—of *Passive Participles*, which have been formed from Active Stems by vowel change. Of this sort are⁽³⁾ (belonging to St. II, 1):—**ማሕተት** “witness” (‘one who is interrogated’); **ዋረክ** “heir” (‘appointed heir’); **ማእመን** “worthy of belief”, “veracious”, “to be relied upon” (the active form being **ማእምን** “he who believes”, *fidelis*) Deut. 7, 9; Matt. 24, 45; Luke, 19, 17,—for which in other passages **ምእመን** stands (from an original **መእመን**, according to § 45); **መቃዐን**

⁽¹⁾ **መጉጉይ** “impious”, if correct at all, would be a much shortened form of **መጌግይ** or **መጌጊ**.

⁽²⁾ LUDOLF: **መስቆቅው**.

⁽³⁾ On the other hand **መልአክ** “messenger”; **ማኅረር** “friend”, “client”,—are, in their origin, names of things, § 116; and so too must be regarded **መግዝእ** “masted”, originally “the mast” (Judges 6, 28 F. Note), and **መብሐት** (Josh. 8, 33) originally “unviolated” (root **تَكَبَّرَ** ‘to be pure’). **መግረር** “subduer”, **መግለብ** “fisher” (v. LUDOLF, ‘Lex.’), and **ማዕቀብ** (Ex. 22, 8) “depositor” must rest either on incorrect readings, or on a tampering with the original forms **መግርር**, **መግልብ**, **ማዕቀብ**.—The word **መቅተል** “murderer” in the *Šalōta Reqēt* is a Hebrew formation and a foreign word; cf. DILLMANN’s ‘Lex.’, col. 441.

“pressed together”, “narrow”, **መቅወን** “a narrow pass”; **መጸብሐ** “obliged to pay tribute”, “liable in taxes”.

Prefix *ma*,
in the
formation of
Names of
Things, to
express
the Place of
the Action.

§ 115. 2. The prefix *ma* is farther employed in a non-personal meaning,—to form *names of things*, or to express *something in which* the root-idea makes its appearance; and it is but seldom, and then only by transference of the notion, that such names of things can take a personal meaning. To be more particular, this formation is employed to designate—(1) *that, in which* the action is accomplished, or *the place* of such action; or (2) *that, with which* it is accomplished, or *the implement* suitable for the action; or (3) *that which is made or produced* by and in the action, or *the products* of the action, *objects of every kind*, and *the action itself*. This type is almost always formed from the Simple Stem,—seldom from derived Stems or from Nouns. The prefix *ma* is joined to the first radical, forming with it a single syllable. As for the rest, different pronunciations have become established for the different classes of words thus formed.

(a) For the purpose of expressing *the place* in which anything happens,—an *a* which follows the second-last radical, and which was originally short, is lengthened, while the *a* of the formative prefix is reduced, before this *ā*, to *e* ⁽¹⁾. This is a very common formation, *e. g.*:—**ምሥራቅ** “the East”; **ምዕራብ** “the West”; **ምሕራም** “temple”; **ምሥዋዕ** “altar”; **ምስማዕ** “hearing-distance”, “reach of hearing”; **ምኅፋር** “*pudenda*”; **ምኅማዝ** “oven”; **ምእኃዝ** “confines”; **ምኑናን** “court of justice”; **ምሥያጥ** “market”; **ምብያት** “night-quarters”; **ምሕዋር** “path”; **ምርዓይ** “pasture”; **ምስታይ** “watering-place”; **ምከዓው** “place where anything is poured out” (Lev. 4, 12); **ምጉያይ** “place of refuge”. From vowel-commencing roots, generally in accordance with § 49, appear **ሙፃእ** “place of exit” (**ወዕክ**); **ሙከፍ** “receptacle”; **ሙቃሥ** “court of justice”; **ሙጋር** “a stone’s-throw” (**ሙላድ**, **ሙሐዝ**, **ሙፋር**); less frequently—**ምውዓል** “prison” (*lit.* ‘place of detention’) (and **ሙዓል** Acts, 4, 3); **ምውዳስ** “place for praise”. Even from roots middle-*u*, by their passing over to the vowel-commencing class in accordance with § 68, we have the forms **ሙባእ** “entrance” (*e. g.* in Hen. 73, 3) ⁽²⁾ as

(¹) It is thus the same form, which serves to denote implements or tools, in Arabic. On the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 538.

(²) [FLEMING adopts here also the reading **ምብዋኢሁ**. · TR.]

well as **ምብዋእ** (*e. g.* in Judges 1, 24 and Josh. 13, 5), and **ሙሐር** “space”, “path” (*e. g.* 4 Esr. 13, 46 ed. Laur.), as well as **ምሕዋር**. But from roots *mediae infirmæ* the form **መካን** “place” is unique in its class, and belongs rather to Arabic⁽¹⁾.

From St. IV, by reducing *a* to *e* in the other syllables as well as in that of the prefix, we can have such forms as **ምስትስራይ** “place of intercession”; **ምስትግባር** “market”; **ምስትስፋሕ** “extension”; **ምስትጉባእ** “assembly” (**ጉ**, § 18), or even, in a remarkable way, with the Passive vowel *ū* in the last syllable⁽²⁾, **ምስትጉብእ** Hen. 46, 8; 53, 6 (“assembly” = ‘the totality of those assembled’): *cf.* also **መስተብቂ** “intercession”. In derivatives from Multiliteral roots,—as the first and second radicals together form only one syllable,—the prefix **መ** or rather **ም** is separately attached: **ምምሕዳን** “place of refuge” (from **ማሕፀን**); **ምክስታር** “rubbish-heap”; **ምፅንጋፅ** “place where one reposes”; **ምውልታው** “place of safety”. This formation is employed throughout to convey the idea of place⁽³⁾. **ማኅደር** is not “an inhabited place”, but “provision for inhabitation” (‘house’, ‘tent’ &c.) or “dwelling”. For the rest v. § 116.

§ 116. (b) For the purpose of denoting *implements and vessels, products and materials of every kind, even the action itself pure and simple or the nature and manner of the action*, the Passive vowel *a* or the Active vowel *e*, after the second radical, is in general sufficient without being lengthened, while the formative prefix **መ** retains its natural pronunciation, with *a*⁽⁴⁾. The *a*-pronunciation in the second syllable is rather more frequent than the one with *e*. Many words have both. No difference in meaning is caused thereby, but it may be observed that all those words which have only the *e*-pronunciation, may be regarded as Neuter participles with an Active signification (§ 114). Many of these words, in both the modes of pronunciation, have farther assumed the closely attached feminine termination **ት**:—Others appear both with and without the **ት**.

To express the Implements or the Products of the Action, or the Action itself:—

(1) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 387.

(2) As if it were a Participial formation.

(3) **መስጊድ** is a foreign word, **مسجد**, and the pure Ethiopic word is **ምስጋድ**.

(4) V., however, KÖNIG, p. 121 *sqq.*

Formation
with *a*
in 2nd
Syllable.

(α) *Formation with a in the second syllable.* From strong roots, and roots *med. gem.*: መልበስ and መልበስት (*málbas* and *málbast*⁽¹⁾) “clothing”; መንበር “throne”; መንፈቅ “half”; መንፈስ “spirit”; መጽሐፍ “book”; መግባር “tool”; መስከብ “*memb. genitale*”; (*Kuf.*)⁽²⁾; መሥለስ “triplet” (or “a third”, a species of measure, not thoroughly identified); መደብ “ledge”, “projection” (*Vḥnn*): መልአክ (‘sending’) “messenger”, “Angel”; ማገፈድ “tower”; ማዕከክ “pelvis”. — Oscillating between *a* and *e* are: — መስቀር and መስቅር “ship” (‘that which is hollowed out’); መንሠግ and መንሥግ “bolt”; መብሰል and መብስል “kitchen-pot”; መብረቅ and መብርቅ “lightning”; መቅሰም and መቅስም “divination”; ማዕሰብ and ማዕስብ (‘abandonment’) “widower” and “widow”. With and without the Feminine-ending: — መስፈር and መስፈርት “measure”; መክደን and መክደንት “covering”, “ceiling”. With Feminine-ending alone: — መክፈልት “portion”; መቅሠፍት “infliction”; መርበብት “net”; መልአክት and መልእክት “business” (besides መልእክት “letter”). In triple form: — ማዕመቅ, ማዕምቅ, ማዕምቅት “depth”; ማዕቀፍ, ማዕቅፍ, ማዕቅፍት “offence”; ማእሰር, ማእስር, ማእሰርት “tie”, “string”; ማእዘን, ማእዘንት, ማእዘንት “corner”. — Roots *tertiæ gutturalis* do not in general lengthen their *a* before the vowel-less Aspirate (in accordance with § 46), but thicken it into *é*, because a long *ā* would transfer them to the formation described in § 115: — መልክእ “image”; ማሕስዕ “young of the herd”; መድቅሕ “consecration”; መርድእ “remedy”, “aid”; መርፍእ “needle”. Only a few lengthen their *a* and then they may reduce the *a* of the first syllable to *e*: መንዝሃ and ምንዝሃ “sprinkling”, “sprinkling-vessel”; ምስማዕ “what is heard” (and “hearing-distance”). መሥዋዕ in the sense of “sacrifice”, usually becomes feminine መሥዋዕት or ምሥዋዕ, and thereby coincides with ምሥዋዕ “altar”⁽³⁾. If they have to retain *a*, they generally take the feminine termination: መጥባሃት “knife” [*cf. Keb. N. p. XIV*]; መስማዕት “obedience”, &c. — In formations from roots beginning with *u*, the mixed-letter pronunciation always makes its appearance, in accordance with § 49: ሞገስ “favour”, “grace”; ሞቀር “chisel”; ሞገድ “flood”; ሞፍጥ,

(1) V., however, TRUMPP, p. 538.

(2) But ምስከብ “couch”.

(3) For this reason copyists often confound ምሥዋዕ and መሥዋዕት; v. for instance Gen. 12, 7, Note.

መፍጥ and **መፈጥ** “chimney”; **ዋሠርት** “saw”; **ዋገርት** “sling”; *tertiæ gutturalis*: **ዋሣእ** “antiphone”; **ዋራእ** “apron”; **ዋፃ⁽¹⁾** and **ዋፃእ** (§ 47) “gift to one who is going on a journey”; **ዋጣሕት** “veil”. For **ዋዐልት** “day” (Amos 8, 9 A) **መዐልት** (**መፃልት**) (§ 44) is usually given. In formations from Roots *mediæ infirmæ*, the consonantal pronunciation prevails: **መጽወር** and **መጽወርት** “carrying-pole”; **ማሕዩብ** “well-bucket”; **መጽያሕት** “beaten or made road”. **መጾር** “a litter”, “*lectica*”, must, however, be noticed (for **መጽወር**, § 40), as distinguished from **መጽወር** “carrying-pole”; noticeable, farther, are **መባእ** “gift” (not derived from **ቦእ**, but from its St. II, 1 **ኣብኣ**) and **መባሕት** “authority”, “*facultas*” (from **ኣብኣ** from **ቦኣ**). **መሶብ** “basket” (or ‘box for unleavened bread’) (*cf.* **مَسَاب**) is formed just like **መጾር**. Words from Roots *tertiæ infirmæ* usually contract *ai* and *au* into *ē* and *ō*:—**መስፌ** “awl”; **ማሕጼ** “axe”; **መሥረይ** and **መሥሬ** “medicine”; **መርጥ** “key”; **ማፅጾ** “lock” (of a door); **መትሎ** “rank”. Occasionally, however, the diphthong is retained; for example, in the following formations from Middle-Aspirate and Doubly Weak Roots:—**መርዐይ** “herd” (Matt. 8, 30 *sqq.*); **ዋደይ** “composition”; **መጥወይ** “instrument of torture”. Feminine forms take the mixed sound always:—**መርዔት** “herd”; **መጽሔት** “mirror”; **ማሕሌት** “song”, “ode”, “psalm”; **መስኮት** “window”; **መድሎት** “weight”; **ማኅቶት** “a light” &c.

This form occurs from Multiliteral roots but rarely, as in **መንጣፅት** “curtain” (from **ኣንጦልዐ**); **መተርኣስ** “whatever is near the head” (as “a pillow”) (from **ተርኣስ**, whence also **ትርኣስ**, § 111); **ምንባሕባሕት** “waterfall” (also **መንባ** G. Ad., from **ኣንባሕብኣ**); **መንኮት** “axis” (Sir. 36, 5, from **ኣንኮከወ**); **መነሳንስት** and **መነሳንሳት** “fan” (also “*aspergilla*”).—A foreign word of this type is found in **መንገን** “machine” (*μάγγανον*).

(β) *Formation with e in the second syllable.* It has been already observed that the most of these words may be regarded as Participles, employed in a non-personal signification:—**መንከር**

Formation
with *e*
in 2nd
Syllable.

(¹) In like manner perhaps **መንታ** “double birth”, “twins”, for **መምታ**, is for **መምታእ** (from **መትኣ** = **።እ።**),—whence **መንተወ** is a farther derivation. So too, probably, by throwing off **ው**, we have **መርዓ** “espousals”, “wedding”—(Root not **ዐረዩ**, but **ረዐወ**, *cf.* **፡፡።**).

“a wonder” or “miracle” (‘what causes wonder’); **መልሐቅ** “anchor” (‘that which enables a ship to cling to something’); **መዕምድ** “a tie” or “connecting strap”; **መንጎር** “pair of bellows” (also, “a pump”); **መፍቅድ** and **መፍቀድ** “need” (‘that which makes one miss something’ and ‘that which is missed’); **መድምም** “miracle” (‘that which causes astonishment’); **መጽብብ** “narrow pass”; **መጽልእ** “what is hated” &c. The Feminine forms of this type are frequently Abstracts: **መልዕልት** “height”; **መብህልት** “contradiction”; **መንግሥት** “kingdom”; **መሥልስት** “third rank”.

This formation does not appear to be in use from roots *mediae infirmae*. From roots *tertia infirmae* it takes the form **መፍትው** “what gives pleasure”, “what is wished for or is convenient”; **መከርይ** “spade”; **መጽርይ** “crocus”; **መርስ** (instead of **መርስው**) “harbour”. Oftener, however, it is found with the Fem. termination:—**መንሱት** “temptation”; **መድሉት** “price”; **መክሊት** “a talent”; **መክሪት** “spade”; **መቅፁት** “pot”. From Multiliterals:—**መሌሊት** “joint”, “limb” (**ሌለየ**).

Prefix *ma*
reduced to
me in 1st
Syllable,
with *ā*, *ā* or
ē in 2nd
Syllable.

(γ) Alongside of these two leading types of Names of things, — as contrasted with designations of locality —, only a few other forms of words appear which call for separate notice. In the forms of several names of things which take *a* in the final syllable, this *a* has been lengthened, and the *a* of the first syllable has been reduced to *e*, so that these words have the same form as Names of Place: **ምግባር** “mode of acting”, “actions”; **ምርካብ** “means of livelihood”, “mode of subsistence”; **ምንግላግ** “a band” (*caterva*); **ምርአይ** “the sight” (Deut. 28, 34); **ሙዳይ** “vessel”; **ሙላድ** not merely “fatherland”, but also “derivation”⁽¹⁾; and **ምራቅ** “sputum” (for *meruāq*) with *u* thrown out, from **ርቅ** = **ወረቅ** (§ 68); in the same fashion also **ምሣር** “hatchet”. In the case of some others, although they keep *ā* or *ē* in the last syllable, *ē* takes the place of *ā* in the first:—**ምርጉዝ** “staff”; **ምጽርይ** = **መጽርይ** (v. *supra*); **ምስሐብ** (a conceptional word, of Infinitive form) “the extracting”: So too with a few fem. Substantive-Numerals, § 159. Farther, some words, originally Participles, have become Names of things: it is thus with **መከየድ** [along with **መክይድ**, in *Kebra Nag.*, p. XXX.] “footstool”, Part. Pass. of **ሰጥ**, 2 (‘that which is trampled on’): so

(1) On the other hand **ምድራስ** is a foreign word, **ሠንገድ**; and **ምንባብ** is “a place for reading”:—(a) ‘A reading-desk’, (b) ‘a lesson’.

too with መግረምት “horror”; መቃጥን “hook” (Matt. 17, 27), a Part.⁽¹⁾ from St. I, 3 or II, 3 (አቃጠነ); መንከራከር “wheel” (‘rolling’), a Part. from St. V of the Multiliteral ከርከራ, with tone-lengthened *ā*. Also, in a few Common Nouns derived from St. I, 3, the Stem-peculiarities have been retained: መላጼ “razor” (from ላጸየ); ምጉጠይ⁽²⁾ “ox-goad” (from ጋጠየ, cf. *جَذَّ*). An Abstract form from ራብዕ “the fourth” is found in መራብዕት “a square” and “squareness”. መዝሙር “psalm” is an Arabic Part. Pass.; in like manner መንዲል “female head-dress” is a foreign word (مَنْدِيل). As to certain peculiar feminine forms v. *infra*, § 127.

(b) *Forms reached by means of Affixes.*

§ 117. The greater number of those words which have been formed by means of Affixes are derived from other and simpler nouns, whether these are still preserved in the language or not (*Denominative Nouns*). In meaning they are either Relative Descriptive words, or Abstract words, and only very seldom mere Names of things. The Affixes themselves are, it is true, of many forms and fashions, but they are essentially traceable to two sorts of terminations having a pronominal origin. The basis of the most of them is constituted by an Adjective-termination common to Semitic tongues.

Denomina-
tive Nouns:
1. Adjective-
Formation:
with ter-
mination *ī*.

1. We start our description, for the reason given, with the *Adjective-Formation*. The termination of Adjectives is taken from a very ancient Demonstrative root *ī* (“he”) and the Relative *ia* (“who”)⁽³⁾, § 65, and originally it has the form *īya* or *āya* (= “he, who”). In the other Semitic languages it was abbreviated, sometimes into *ī* (‘—, ى—), sometimes into *ai*, *ē* (—°, ى—)⁽⁴⁾ [Assyrian,—*ai* or, with contraction,—*ū*]: In Ethiopic it attained a triple form, as *ī*, *āi*, and—with an intervening letter separating

(¹) If it be not an Inner Plural.

(²) Unless it stands for ምጉጠይ.

(³) The propriety of comparing this termination with the Relative Pron. is shown by the fact, that in Ethiopic another Relative Pron. with the force of a Genitive sign is placed before Substantives to form Relative Adjectives: ዘመንፈስ “who (is) of the “spirit” = “spiritual”.

(⁴) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, § 164, c.

these vowels (§ 41)—*āwī*. The last two forms have pretty much the same meaning and are occasionally exchanged for one another in the same word; but it is seldom that *ī* on the one hand, and *āī*, *āwī* on the other are interchanged.—Each has its own application.

(a) The termination *ī* is chiefly employed to form Nouns denoting the *Agent*, from simpler nouns connected with persons. It is comparatively seldom in use for the derivation of simple Adjectives.

With *ī*
attached to
Nouns of
the Type
gabbār or
from any of
the Derived
Stems.

(α) Especially is it attached to those Nouns of the type **ገበሬ** *gabbār*, which denote the Agent (§ 110, α), and in that case its chief use is to distinguish a Substantive which indicates an Agent from a mere relative Adjective, *e. g.*:—**ሐረሲ** “husbandman”; **ነጋሢ** “king”; **ወላዲ** “procreator”; **ረዋጺ** “runner”; **ነግድ** “hunter”; **ሐሳዊ** “liar”; **ረአዩ** “seer”; **ሰያፊ** “sword-bearer”. But several words of this type have also a purely Adjective-meaning: **መሐሪ** “merciful”; **በቃሢ** “useful”; **ነበበ** λογικός; **ሐማሢ** “sickly”, “surlly”; **የዋሂ** “gentle”; **ዐያሊ** “astray” (G. Ad.), &c. The Ending itself in these formations is always accentuated, according to TRUMPP, (p. 539): *ḥarrāsī*.

While, however, the simple type, without any Ending, is formed only from the doubled Stem, that which is compounded with the Adjective-ending may be formed from any of the derived Stems, and then it takes the place of Participles, or is exchanged for them without any essential difference in meaning. Just as in the Adjective-formation (§ 108, α and § 110, α), the second-last Radical has always *ā* (with the tone); in other respects the pronunciation of the Perfect-Stem is maintained with *a*. From St. I, 3: **ናዛቢ** “comforter”; **ናፋቂ** “unbelieving”; **ሣራሪ** founder⁽¹⁾. From St. II, 1: **አሥጋሪ** “fisher”; **አግባኢ** “traitor”; **አብሳሪ** “bringing a glad message”; **አንባቢ** “reader”; **አጥራቂ** ἀπασπασμένος (Lev. 22, 24, Root **طرق**); **አባኢ** “he who introduces” (from **አብኢ**, from **ቦኢ**) &c. But from Roots *tertiæ gutturalis*, as *ā* is not merely lengthened, but also, in accordance with § 45, dulled into *e*, we have **አንቅሢ**⁽²⁾ “awakener”; **አብዝኢ**⁽²⁾ “multiplier” (*abzeḥī*), and from St. II, 2: **አሰሳሊ** “he who removes or expels”.

(1) **ጥናፊ** is peculiar, if correct at all.

(2) According to LUDOLF'S ‘Lex.’.

From the Reflexive Stems III this formation comes all the more frequently, that they do not form any Participles with *መ* prefixed. Examples,—from III, 1: **ተሐዋሲ** “that which stirs”; **ተሠያሚ** “set up”, “brought forward”.—From III, 2: **ተፈናዊ** “sent”; **ተዐጋሚ** “patient”; **ተጠያሪ** “augur”; **ተአዛዚ** “obedient”; **ተዐጋሊ** “robber”.—From III, 3: **ተሳላቂ** “mock”; **ተዋናዪ** “player” (‘actor’); **ተዋራሲ** “co-heir”. From Stems IV, 1, 3: **አስተባቢ** “intercessor”; **አስተርጓሚ** “interpreter”; **አስተጋብኢ** (because *tertiæ gutturalis*) “convener”.

From *Multiliteral Roots*: St. I: **ማሳኒ** “perishable”; **ባሕታዊ** “solitary”; **ጠንቃቂ** “inquirer”; **ቶሳሒ** “one who mixes”; **ቤዛዊ** “redeemer”; **ኖላዊ** “shepherd”; **በርባሪ** “robber”; **ደምሳሲ** “destroyer”; **ዘርካዪ** “calumniator”⁽¹⁾:—St. II: **አማሳኒ** “spoiler”; **አጸንሐሒ** “one who brings a burnt-offering”.

§ 118. (β) In like manner *this ī is frequently attached to Participles,—formed by means of መ,—to raise them to be Nomina Agentis*⁽²⁾. It has the tone. This formation occurs most frequently in the case of Participles of St. II, 1, in which at the same time the *e* of the last syllable of the original Participle passes into *a*. This *a* is but seldom lengthened into *ā*,—and that in the case of Middle-Aspirate roots (§ 48): **መቅለሊ** “one who facilitates”; **መቀሳሊ** “one who wounds”; **መምለኪ** “one who fears God”; **ማሕጉሊ** “destroyer”; **መፍቀሪ** “lover”; **ማሕየዊ** “life-giver”; **መድኅኒ** “saviour” (= **መድኅን**), and many others;—**መብዓሊ** “who makes rich”; **መስሐቲ** “who leads astray” (along with the form **መስሕት**)⁽³⁾. But *e* remains unaltered in Derivatives from roots *tertiæ gutturalis*: **መብርሂ** “enlightener”; **መንሥኢ** “one who arouses”; **መንጽሐ** “purifier”; **መፍትሐ** “opener” &c. We have, however, **መርዳኢ** “assistant”. In most of the cases in which this outer formation occurs, the simple form of the Participle is no longer in use.

With *ī*
attached to
Participles
formed by
means of
ma, turning
them into
Nomina
Agentis.

⁽¹⁾ On the other hand **ፃዋዊ** “taken captive” (in Passive sense), from **ፃዋ** and *āwī*, belongs to § 119 (Ex. 12, 29).

⁽²⁾ The doubts entertained by PRAETORIUS, ZDMG XLI, p. 689 (*cf.* also KÖNIG, p. 124 *sq.*), appear to me to be without foundation.

⁽³⁾ **መንስቲ**, **መዝላፊ** perhaps rest only on copyist's errors; **መድላዊ** might have taken that form of pronunciation by way of assimilation to the Adjective-Ending *āwī*.

From the other Stems the outer formation occurs with rather less frequency.—The original pronunciation of the Part. remains unchanged. St. I, 2: **መፈውሐ**. (= **መፈውስ**) “physician”; St. I, 3: **መሳብኢ** “exorcist” (Hen. 8, 3); **መባልሐ** “liberator”; **መናዝዚ** “comforter”; St. IV, 1: **መስተፍሥሐ** and 2: **መስተፈሥሐ** “one who bestows gladness”, “comforter”; 3: **መስተጋብኢ** “one who assembles” (= **አስተጋብኢ**). From Multiliteral roots St. II: **መጣእጥኢ** “one who prepares food”; **መጣዓዊ** (and in shortened form **መጥዓዊ**) “worshipper of idols”.

With \bar{i}
attached to
Proper
Names and
a few Per-
sonal Words
and Names
of Things.

(γ) \bar{i} is frequently used, to derive Relative Adjectives from Proper names. In the case of Names ending in a vowel, the \bar{i} is generally hardened into y (v. numerous examples in Numb. 26).—More rarely this \bar{i} is employed for the purpose of deriving *Adjectives or Nom. ag. from Substantives*: **መዝበሪ** “destroyer” (from **መዝበር**); **ተፍጻሚ** “the last” (**ተፍጻም**); **አረሚ** (‘Aramaic’) “heathenish”; **ዐረቢ** “Arabic”, “Arab”; **ባሕሪ** and **ባሕርይ** “pearl” (‘sprung from the sea’). It is not seldom attached,—superfluously, to all appearance,—to certain Personal words and Names of things, of the masculine gender: **ብእሐ** “man” (‘bold’, ‘warlike’); **አባዊ** “Nile river or flood” (**أَبَاب**)⁽¹⁾; **ከይሐ** “serpent” (‘cunning’, **كاس**)⁽²⁾; **ተከዚ** “river” (**ፕውሕዝ**) [?]; **ዐንበሪ** “sea-monster” = **ዐንበር**; **ዐረቢ** “West” (Ex. 26, 20, 35; Josh. 5, 10); **ጸንጸሊ** “cymbal” (‘tinkling’); **አፍራሐ** “rider”, “horseman”. Probably **ሐርጌ** “ram” (Hen. 89, 43) had also at first the form **ሐርጊ**, and properly **ሐርጌ** is the form of the constr. state or the accus. Farther **ቀልዓ** “a youth”, “servant”, “boy” is perhaps to be judged of in the same fashion. Feminine Stems take \bar{e} instead (from *iyah*, **يَا**, § 40): **አንቄ** “hawk” as well as **አንቄት**; **ጉርዔ** “throat” (v. also § 127, c); or $\bar{e}t$ (**يَت**): **ላጽቂት** *μυγάλη* (cf. **لَرِيْق**)⁽³⁾; **ዘርቤት** “carpet” (**زَبِيَّة**); more rarely $\bar{i}t$: **አብላሊት** “stinging nettle”.

§ 119. (b) The stronger ending $\bar{a}w\bar{i}$ ⁽⁴⁾ serves the purpose of

⁽¹⁾ [A name generally given to the ‘Abyssinian Nile’, v. ‘*Lex*’. TR.]

⁽²⁾ [In ‘*Lex*.’ DILLMANN prefers the meaning ‘twisting’, and chooses the etymon **كاس** (mid. **و**, not mid. **ي**). Others think the word might be of old African origin. TR.]

⁽³⁾ [Cf. also DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex*.’, col. 64. TR.]

⁽⁴⁾ According to TRUMPP, p. 539, to be accentuated as $\bar{a}w\bar{i}$.—As to the origin cf. KÖNIG, p. 130.

deriving new Adjectives, and words indicating persons, from Substantives (and Adjectives). It is true that in Ethiopic, Adjectives may with almost greater ease be indicated periphrastically by means of the Genitive relation of Substantives; and, in ordinary prose at least, this periphrastic indication of an Adjective is more in use than the express Adjective-formation. The faculty, however, of deriving new Adjectives by means of that ending has remained active in the language. It is always possible to frame such an adjective from any and every word; and, in poetic and learned diction, it has often been practised. In such cases the interior vowels of the fundamental word remain unchanged, and the termination has a merely external attachment (contrived,—for fundamental words which end in a vowel—, in accordance with the rules described in § 39 *sqq.*). In this way relative Adjectives may be formed even from Plural forms, Foreign words and Proper Names. For example,—**ምድራዊ** “earthly” (**ምድር**); **ባሕራዊ** “pertaining to the sea”; **ዓለማዊ** “worldly”; **ሕዝባዊ** “layman”; **ፈረሳዊ** “horseman”, “knight”; **ፈያታዊ** (from **ፈያት**) “robber”; **ገባራዊ** “workman” (*nom. unitat.* from *coll.* **ገባር**); **ፀራዊ** “hostile” (from **ፀር**); even from **አብ** “father”, a feminine form **አባዊት** “ancestress” (G. Ad.); from **ሥጋ**, **ሥጋዊ** “fleshly”; from **ዐንበሳ**, **ዐንበሳዊ** “lion-like”; **እንስሳዊ** “animal” *adj.* (**እንስሳ**); **መርዓዊ** “*sponsus*”, *i. e.* “bridegroom” (from **መርዓ**). From Nominal Stems increased externally: **መስቀላዊ** “relating to the cross” (**መስቀል**); **መንፈሳዊ** “spiritual”; **ሰንበታዊ** “Sabbatical”; **አእምሮታዊ** “scientific” (from Inf. **አእምሮት**); **ድንግልናዊ** “maidenly” (from **ድንግልና** “maidenhood”). From Plural forms; **አብያታዊ** “domestic”; **ረዐይታዊ** “gigantic”; **ክርስቲያናዊ** “Christian” *adj.* From Foreign words and Proper Names: **መነኮሳዊ** “monastic”; **አይሁዳዊ** “Jewish”; **ዕብራዊ** “Hebrew”; **ወንጌላዊ** “Evangelist”; even **እግዚአብሔራዊ** “relating to God”; **እንሰ** : **እመሕያዊ** ⁽¹⁾ “human”; **ዘለዓለማዊ** “eternal”. Farther, this termination may be applied to Adjectives:

Adjective-Formation; with termination *āwī*, in the derivation, from Substantives and Adjectives, of New Adjectives and Words indicating Persons.

(1) [**እንሰ** means “progeny”, and **እመሕያው** or **እመ** : **ሕያው** means “mother of a living one”, *i. e.* “mother of the living”.—Accordingly **እንሰ** : **እመሕያው** signifies literally “progeny of the mother of the living”, that is “the human race”, “*homines*”. From this compound substantive, the adjective, given in the text, is formed by attaching *āwī* to the second member. TR.]

ቅዱሳዊ “relating to what is holy”; **ብፁዓዊ** “appertaining to the blessed”; to the Interrogative **አይ** (§ 63):—**አያዊ** and **አያይ** (‘of what kind’) “like”, “equal”; also to words which are only used as Adverbs or Prepositions: **አፍአዊ** “external” (**አፍአ**); **ላዕላዊ** “upper”; **ታሕታዊ**⁽¹⁾ “lower”. A foreign word of this kind is met with in **ኖትያዊ** “sailor”, “shipman”, *ναύτης*.

Shorter
Ending *āi*,
alternating
with *āwī*,
at least in
Numeral
Adjectives.

*The shorter ending āi alternates at pleasure with āwī, at least in Numeral Adjectives (§ 159), but otherwise it is retained only in a few words:—***ታሕታይ** and **ታሕታዊ**; **ላዕላይ** and **ላዕላዊ**; **ተባዕታይ** and **ተባዕታዊ** “masculine”; **አያይ** and **አያዊ**; **ደኃራይ** and **ደኃራዊ** “the last”; **ፈያታይ** alongside of **ፈያታዊ** “robber”; **ፀራይ** as well as **ፀራዊ** “hostile”; **አረጋይ** as well as **አረጋዊ** “old”. Also, **ሥርናይ** “corn” (§ 47, from **ሥዕርና** ‘covering with hair’); **ቀወፋይ** “Holiest of all” (Ex. 26, 33), properly ‘the (place) which is devoted to the service of God’ (*cf.* **ጌጃኒኒ**).

Somewhat irregular forms are exhibited by:—**ጽጋይ** “flowery” (from **ጽጌ**); **ጉሕላዊ** “treacherous” (from **ጉሕሉት**); **ከነናዊ** “judicial” (from **ከነኔ**); (**አቤራዊ** and) **አቤራዊ** (from **አቤር**) “old”.

§ 120. 2. By attaching the sign of the Feminine to these Adjective-Endings, a number of *Endings* are produced *which are used to indicate Abstract Nouns*.

(a) In very rare cases the termination *yā* has this meaning in the formation of Collectives (v. § 140). Somewhat more frequently the termination *īt*⁽²⁾ is employed to form Abstracts or Collectives, chiefly from verbals in *i*: **ነፋጺት** “the portion which has escaped (disaster)” or “remnant” from **ነፋጺ**⁽³⁾; **ጎላፊት** “people travelling or passing by”; in the same way **ነጋዲት** (*e. g.* Judges 19, 17); **ፀባኢት** “army”; **ሀገሪት** “townspeople” (Col. 3, 11); Farther **ደኃሪት** “end”; **ቀዳሚት** “beginning” (Matt. 12, 45); **ውሳጢት** “what is inward”; **ባሕቲት** “solitude”; **መድኅኒት** “redemption”, “salvation” (from **መድኅኒ** “Redeemer”, “Saviour”); **ረዳኢት** “help”; **በዋኢት** “a crowd of people entering”; **ታሕጸጺት** “diminution”, “waning” (Hen. 78, 15); **ብርሃናዊት** “luminous nature” (from **ብርሃናዊ**

⁽¹⁾ At one time they also used the form **ላዕልይ** instead, (Judges 1, 36 Note) and **ታሕትይ** Josh. 11, 16 (*cf.* 16, 3; 18, 13) with the simpler ending *ī* **ئى**.

⁽²⁾ *Cf.* the same ending in the *Mehri*: v. MALTZAN, ZDMG XXVII, p. 282 [and A. JAHN, ‘Gramm. d. Mehri-Spr.’, Vienna 1905, p. 55 sqq.].

⁽³⁾ Like **ገጃኒኒ** from **ገኒኒ**.

G. Ad. 15, 16). Even without the interposition of an Adjective in *ī*, Abstracts are derived from simpler Nominal Stems by appending the termination *īt*: **ንስቲት** “a small quantity”; **ጽምሒት** and **ጽሒት** “secrecy”; **ድጎሪት** ⁽¹⁾ “the being turned back”; **እርያዊት** (“quality”) **كَيْفِيَّة** ⁽²⁾; **ንንጽሊት** “perversion”; **ቀልቀሊት** “steepness”; **እስኪት** “testicles” (**ገሣጽ**, *V* **ገሣጽ**) ⁽³⁾. This termination is often used to derive (from Numerals) Substantives and Adjectives which express multiplicity, v. § 159. But just as in the other Semitic languages, so also in Ethiopic the termination *ūt* ⁽⁴⁾ may take the place of this *īt*, and with the same force; yet it is only in a few words that this ending continues to be represented:—**ኀሩት** “goodness” (from **ኀር**); **ጉሕሉት** “fraud”; **ጽልሐት** “artifice”, “cunning” (**اصطلاح**); **ወርዘት** “youth” (*V* **ዘ**) ⁽⁵⁾.

(b) More frequently, however, these terminations are shaded with the *a*-sound. Just as the ordinary Adjective-Endings took the form of *āi* and *āwī* instead of *ī*,—so too, in the formation of Abstract Nouns, the feminine ending, *ēt*,—or, with vowel-close, *ē*,—is employed instead of *īt*.

Often as
ēt or *ē*;
Abstracts
in *ēt*;
Conception-
al Words
in *ē*

(α) Some few Abstract Nouns are still derived from simpler words, by means of the ending *ēt*, from *iat* = *ait* ⁽⁶⁾: **ረድኡት** “help”; **በቀኔት** “advantage” (from **ረድኡ**, **በቀኖ**); **ተፍጻሜት** “consummation”, “end” (from **ተፍጻም**); **ዕብሬት** “fruit”, “succession” (with prep. Gen. 12, 13, *propter*) from a lost word like **ንጋህ** ⁽⁷⁾; and **ዕብሬት** “sterility” from **ዕብር** “unfruitful”. The place of an Infinitive, derived straight from **አእኩተ** (II, 1 of **አኩተ**), is supplied by **አኩተት** “thanksgiving” (for **አእኩተት**).

from Verbal
Stems.

[1] [Generally used in the Acc. adverbially, **ድጎሪተ** “backwards”, “again”. TR.]

[2] [Cf. also **اِلهِيَّة**, *ποιότης*, *qualitas*. TR.]

[3] Not *V* **ሰከየ**, as this does not mean—“to indicate” (GESENIUS).

[4] V. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 165, *b*.

[5] **ኀረወ**, **ንሕለወ**, **ጸልሐወ** and **ወርዘወ** are only derivatives of these, § 73.

[6] V. on the other hand KÖNIG, p. 113.

[7] [A different derivation is given in the ‘*Lexicon*’, col. 507, where **እብሬት** or **ዕብሬት**, meaning “succession”, is said to be made up of **ብሬት** (from **በረየ**) and prosthetic **አ**. TR.]

(β) More usual, however, is the shorter, vowel-ending termination \bar{e} , by means of which Infinitive-like conceptional words are derived from the several Verbal Stems. This formation is at once an inner and an outer one. Into the interior of the form the lengthened \bar{a} ,—which is made use of in the formation of Abstracts (§§ 107, β and 111 *a*, β),—makes its way: it takes the accent (TRUMPP, p. 540), while the *a* of the preceding syllable must be reduced to \bar{e} , and \bar{a} (in St. I, 3) to \bar{u} ⁽¹⁾. Externally the toneless \bar{e} attaches itself to this form. The formation occurs oftenest as a derivative from St. I, 2 & 3 of the tri-radical verb, and St. I of the Multiliteral, but only very rarely from St. I, 1 (**ክዋኔ** “existence”; **ምዋኤ** “song of triumph”). From St. I, 2 come, *e. g.* **ሕዳሴ** “renewal” (*heddāse*); **ፍጹሚ** “completion”; **ምሳሌ** “comparison”, “parable”; **ሥላሴ** “Trinity”; **እማሬ** “demonstration”; **ወዳሴ** “praise”; **ይባቤ** “jubilation”; **ወፋዩ** “yielding up”; **ሕሳዩ** “untruth”. So too:—**ሕማሚ** “affliction” (St. I, 2 replacing here Stem **አስመመ**); **እኳቲ** “thanksgiving” (**አእኩተ**); **ሥጣዩ** “answer” (**ተሠጥወ**). Peculiar forms present themselves in **ክነኔ** (*kuennané*) “judgment”; **ኅበኔ** as well as **ኅበኔ** “skirt of a garment”; **ሕመሚ** “affliction”; **ጽነፌ** “end” ⁽²⁾, in which long \bar{a} has not made its way within the word,—and **ሚያኔ** “deception” (from **መየነ**), in which long \bar{i} takes the place of the doubling of the second radical. From St. I, 3: **ጉባኤ** “assembly”; **ኩፋሌ** “partition”; **ቡራኬ** “blessing”; **ሐያጺ** “observation” (*Kuf.*) ⁽³⁾. Several roots, which are no longer used as verbs in St. I, 3, have this formation,—in part from St. III, 3 and IV, 3, like **ሩካቤ** with **ተራከበ**, and **ኑባሬ** “institution” with **አስተናበረ**. From **ሳብዕ** “the seventh” **ሰባኤ** “week” (“the seven”) has been derived. This form is exceedingly rare from Reflexive Stems, the formations noticed in § 111 proving sufficient for these: **ትስባኤ** as well as **ትስባኤ** “human nature”, “incarnation” = **ትስብ እት**; **ትንሣኤ** “resurrection”. On the other hand it is very common from Multiliteral roots:—St. I:—**ልምላሚ** “freshness”; **ድንጋሌ** “maidenly bearing”; **ብጉባኤ** “putrefaction”; **ፍልሳፌ** “philosophy”; **ምንሳዩ** “temptation”; **ወርዛዩ** “youth”; **ጊዋዩ** “imprison-

(1) But v. KÖNIG, p. 124.

(2) Cf. LUDOLF'S '*Lex.*' s. v.

(3) **ዑዋዩ**, **ኑፋዩ**, **ኑታኔ**, **ቡዓደ**, **ሰላሚ**, **ሰታፌ**, **ሠራሬ**, **ኑዛቤ**, **ሩካኬ**, **ኑባሬ**, **ሉዓሌ**, **ሐቃፌ**, **ሠራሐ**, **ሐጸጸ**, **ዑቃቤ**, **ዑጸፌ**.

ment", "captivity" (**ዒወወ**); **ሙቃሔ** "taking captive" (**ሞቅሐ**) &c.:—St. V: **እንጡላዔ** "veiling".—A foreign word of this type is met with in **ስንዳሌ** *σεμιδαλῖς*. But even from simpler Stems Conceptional words (and Names of things) may be derived by means of the termination *ē*, as well as by the termination *ēt* (*v. supra*): **ወይሌ** "howling" (from **ወይል** § 61); **ሕንጺ** as well as **ሕንጻ** "a building"; **ናዕዌ** "hunting" ⁽¹⁾; **ሕንብርብሬ** "scab"; **እንጸንጸ** 'name of a disease'; perhaps also **ዕድሜ** "set time"; **ቊንቊን** "woodworms" ('humming'), and some of the words mentioned in § 127, *c*.

§ 121. (*c*) Just as *ēt* is formed from *ūt* by the admixture of an *a*-sound, so is *ōt*,—or as a vowel-ending—*ō*, from *ūt*. (*α*) The accented termination *ōt* (TRUMPP, p. 540),—the Hebr.-Aramaic *ūt*—, has been extensively employed in the formation of the Infinitive (*v. § 125*), but otherwise it is found only in a few words, some of them foreign. Formations of native origin are: **መለኮት** "Godhead" (from **አምላክ**); **ምልኮት** "property"; **ጽላሎት** "shadow" (*cf.* **ጽላሌ**); **ጥብዖት** *σύνταξις* ('daily task', from **ጥብዕ**, Ex. 5); **ጺአት** "filth" (G. Ad., from **ጺአ**); **ዒዖት** "low grounds", "meadows" (*cf.* **واضعة**). The following are foreign words: **ሃይማኖት** "faith", **إِيمَانًا**; **ሰሊጥት** "Cassia" (**سَلِيلَكَة**); **አሶት** "healing" (**إِلَهَامَة**); **ታሶት** "ark" (**قَابُوت**) ⁽²⁾.

(*β*) The similarly accented termination *ō* is likewise employed very frequently in the formation of the Infinitive (*v. § 125*). Outside of this use it is chiefly of service in the derivation of Names of the products of artistic skill (from Substantives of the type **ግብር**):—**ሥብከ** "casting"; **ቅፍሎ** "what is overlaid with metal"; **ብስሎ** "cooked food"; **እንጥ** "web"; **ወቅሮ** "hewn work"; **ዝብጦ** "tin-work"; **ግልፎ** "carved work"; **ጥብሶ** "roast meat"; **ጥወጥ** "turnery"; **ፍሕቆ** "turned work"; **ፍትሎ** "net-work"; **ርፍአ** "tailor's work"; **ዕፍሮ** "basket-ware"; **ቊጽሮ** "net-work", "fringes"; **ወጽቦ** "nose- and ear-ornaments"; **ድርጎ** "assignment"; **ግዝሮ** "circumcision" ⁽³⁾.

(1) The older mode of writing it,—**ነዕዌ** *e. g.* Lev. 17, 13 F. H—speaks against the conjecture that **ናዕዌ** stands for **ንዓዌ**.

(2) Of unknown derivation are **አኮት** "small locust" (*cf.* **غَزَّالَة**), **ጸፁት** and **ጸዖት** 'a stinging insect', **ሐለስትዮት** "baboon".

(3) Perhaps also **አንቆቅጥ** "egg", as a result or consequence of cackling, if **አንቆቅጎ** (*cf.* **عَقَقَ**) really means "to cackle". [A startling view! *TR.*]

In other applications this ending appears only in rare cases:—**ጸልቦ** “cross”; **ቀድሖ** “well-bucket”; **ከበሮ** “drum”, (‘timbrel’, Ex. 15, 20) (**كَبَر**); **ከረቦ** “basket” (‘basket-, or mat-work’, **كرب**); **ጸሎ** “soot”; **ደረከኖ** and **ደርከኖ** “hyacinth-colour”; **መሰንቆ** ‘a musical instrument’ (**κιθάρα**, [cf. *Kebrā Nag.* p. XXV.] Plur. **መሰንቆታት** Rev. 14, 2)⁽¹⁾; **ትክቶ** “the condition of having monthly courses” (from **ትክት** “*mulier menstruata*”, probably for **ትክአት** **፲፭፻፳፱** VIII and **፲፭፻፳፱**, ‘reclining’; ‘sitting’; to elucidate the notion cf. Gen. 31, 35); **ከበሎ** and **ከንበሎ** “hook or ring” (on a sandal); **ከብሶ** and **ከብሶ** “hair-net”⁽²⁾.

Nouns of
Circum-
stance and
Condition,
in Tone-
bearing
ât.

(d) The *tone-bearing termination ât*,—which is applied to Nouns of simpler form, to express notions of circumstance or condition,—has come into being, sometimes from *ôt* by a change of vowels, sometimes from the simple Feminine-ending *at* by the process of lengthening the vowel:—**ልህቃት** “old age”, “seniority” (= **ልህቅና**) from **ልሂቅ**; **ነኣሳት** “youth”, “minority” (Gen. 43, 33) from **ንኡስ** or **ንኣስ**; **ቅድሳት** “sanctuary”, “holiness” from **ቅዱስ**; **ኅድጋት** “state of divorcement” from **ኅዱግ**; **ስርዖት** “the condition of one who has obtained **ስርዖት**, *i. e.* ‘remission of sins’”; **ቅንዖት** “slavery”, *i. e.* “the state of **ቅኔ** (‘servitude’)”; **ምርዓት** “wantonness”; **ጽድቃት**⁽³⁾ “benevolence”,—in which **ጽድቅ** (‘probity’ or ‘piety’) is shown. This *ât* is occasionally substituted for *at*, *e. g.* in **ስብኣት** “glory”, alongside of **ስብሐት**; **ሐብላት** “plaited-work” (Judges 8, 26; Ex. 35, 22, Note) along with **ሐብለት**; and *at* itself is sufficient for the derivation of Abstracts from simpler Nominal Stems:—**ሰብኣት** “humanity” from **ሰብኣ**; **ምስኪነት** “poverty” from **ምስኪን**. In **ብስራት** “glad tidings” (**በገሃጃ**), *â* seems to be only

(1) [Where **φωγῖν . . . κιδάρωδων κιδαρίζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιδάραις αὐτῶν** is translated **ቃለ : መሰናቆት : ሶበ : ይሰነቅወ : በመሰንቆታቲ ሆሙ**. TR.]

(2) The following are of obscure derivation: **ፍሕሶ** ‘name of a flower’; **ሰገኖ** “ostrich” (cf. **صَعَوْن**); **ዐውሎ** “tempest”; **ዶርሆ** “domestic fowl”; **ገቦ** “side” (cf. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’ *et supra*) and **ቀፎ** “basket”: but the *u* in **ምዕኖ** “mire” seems to belong to the root; cf. **عَيْنِيَّة**.

(3) [But in ‘*Lex.*’, col. 1312, DILLMANN represents **ጽድቃት** ‘*eleemosynae*’ as a plural of **ጽድቅ**. TR.]

lengthened by the tone⁽¹⁾. Similarly, simple Feminines of the Passive Participle may also take the meaning of Abstracts, v. § 128.

§ 122. (e) But besides these terminations, which in the last resort all depend upon the Adjective-ending *ī*, Ethiopic has an additional Abstract ending, also accented, viz. *ān* or *nā*, which is manifestly of pronominal origin, v. § 62⁽²⁾. As may be perceived from the other Semitic tongues, this termination—*an*—at one time produced Adjectives, and it was only in lengthening it to *ān* or *ōn* that it came to be employed farther in the formation of Abstracts issuing from such Adjectives. Only a few traces have been retained in Ethiopic of the application of this ending in the formation of Adjectives, but examples are pretty common of its use in the production of Abstracts. As has been already pointed out (§ 62), the demonstrative word concerned was capable at first of being pronounced both as *an* and *na*. Ethiopic,—in this again richer than the other Semitic tongues—, has developed and preserved both pronunciations even in the formation of Nouns, with a slight idiomatic variation of meaning, the *nā*-form of pronunciation being the more common one.

Abstract
Forms in
ān or *ōn*
and *nā*.

(α) The termination *ān* is commonly applied to Nominal Stems of the First simple form; and by means of this doubled,—inner and outer—, formation, *stronger conceptional* or *notional words* are derived: **ርሥኣን** (*reš'ān*) “old age” from **ርሥኣ**; **ላህቃን** “seniority” (G. Ad.); **ብርሃን** “brightness”, “light”; **ሥልጣን** “authority”; **ቀርባን** “oblation”; **ሕልያን** “bribe”; **ድርሳን** “dissertation”; **ጽልኣን** “hatred”; **ኪዳን** “covenant”⁽³⁾. The only instance, still retained, of the employment of this termination

(1) It may be that **ዐሥራት** “the tenth, or tithe” is formed in the same way, or else it stands for **ዐሥራይት**, like **ዐውያት** “loud lament”, for **ዐውያውት**. On **እሳት** and **ትካት** v. § 128. Cf. also KÖNIG, p. 116 sq.

(2) Cf. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 163, b.

(3) Farther: **ዕርቃን**, **ምዕዳን**, **ፍርቃን**, **ፍልጣን**, **ብልዓን**, **ግዕዛን**; also **ቅጥራን** “tar” (قَطْرَان); but **ልሳን** “tongue” is a very old word of a different formation (ܠܝܫܢ, [Assyr. *lišānu*]); and **ሰይጣን** “Satan” (شَيْطَان, ܣܬܐ) is a foreign word.—For the formation of these types cf. also KÖNIG, p. 123 sq.

in the formation of words indicating persons, is met with in the foreign word ትርጉማን “interpreter”. Sometimes *ōn* takes the place of *ān*, as in ዘይቶን “oliveyard” (زَيْتُون), and ዐሥርን “decade”⁽¹⁾. In Amharic *ān* usually passes into *ām*⁽²⁾, which is then used often to form adjectives (e. g. ስናም “one who has large teeth”).—Even in Ethiopic, traces of this *ām* are come upon: ቀስታም “bow” and “shepherd’s crook” (from ቀስት, cf. قُسطان); and perhaps ንሰም “the morrow”, “to-morrow” (Ex. 32,5; Josh. 3,5; Matt. 6,30) from ንሰ (أخذ).

(β) The termination *nā*, also accented, is in much more frequent use, to derive from Nominal Stems of every kind fresh and final conceptional words, which express sometimes conditions and properties, but especially dignities, offices, age, standing, and so forth, and which answer mostly to our conceptional words in *-ness*, *-hood*, *-dom*, *-ship*. Derivatives from Nominal Stems of the First simple form are exhibited, for example, in ርእሰና “the princely dignity” (ርእስ); ብኩርና (*bekuernā*) “right of birth” (በኩር); እርግና “old age” (እርግ); ምልክና “lordship” (مُلْك); ቅድምና “precedence” (ቅድም); ዳኅና and ደኅና “health”, “soundness”; ዕርቅና “nakedness”; ግዕዝና “emancipation”; ግግጽና “fear”. The *ū* of the Passive Part. has to be shortened into *e* before *nā*—ልዕልና “height” (*le’elnā*, ልዑል); ርጥብና “dampness”, “humidity” (ርጡብ); ስብሕና “magnificence” (ስቡሕ); ቅድስና “holiness”; ጥይቅና “exactness”, “accuracy” (ጥየቅ); ትሕትና “modesty” (ትሑት); ግይርና (*geyernā*) “position of a foreigner” (ግየር); ሙስና (*mūsennā*) “corruption” (from ሙሱን); ፍድፍድና “superabundance” (from ፍድፋድ); ፍልስፍና “philosophy” (from ፍልሰፍ):—*Tertiae infirmæ*: ሀሉና “essence” (ሀልዑ); ልቡና “understanding”; ሕሊና “faculty of thinking”; ዕሪና “equality” (ዕሩይ); ጥሒና “good health”, “soundness”; ዕሙና “solitude”. Farther, the fundamental Nominal Stems concerned suffer occasionally still stronger abbreviation before this ending; ሕፃንና and ሕፀና (*heṣannā*) “childhood” (ሕፃን); ቅስስና and even ቅስና “seniority” (from ቀሲስ); ምስፍና (*mesfennā*) “leadership”, from ምስፍን; ምልእክና “princely dignity”, from

(1) ዐሥርን: ቃል “Decalogus” (Hymnology).

(2) ISENBERG, ‘Gramm.’ p. 33 [and GUIDI, ‘Gramm. elem.’ p. 15, Note 1].—Cf., in Hebrew, EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ § 133 sq.

መልአክ⁽¹⁾; **ትንብልና** “intercession”, from **ተንበል**; **ምንኩስና** “monastic life”, from **መነኮስ**; **ኀረውና** and **ኀርውና** “goodness”, from **ኀሩት**. But in other words the vowels of the ground-word are retained, in a body, unaltered: **ሊቅና** “seniority” (**ሊቅ**); **መሐሐና** “Messiahship”; **ጠቢብና** “philosophy”; **እግዚእና** “dominion”, “superiority”; **ዋሕድና** “singularity”; **ስርግውና** “ornament” (**ስርግው**); **ውርዝውና** “youth” (**ውርዝው**); **ድንግልና** “virginity” (**ድንግል**); **ቴዎሎግና** “theology”; **ጥንቅቅና** “complete agreement”; **ዐራቅይና** “mediatorship”; **እጓለ፡ ማውትና** “state of orphanage”, “pupillarity”; **ሊቀ፡ ጳጳስና** “archiepiscopate”, “patriarchate”; **ብሉዩ፡ መዋዕልና** “eternity” (‘the antiquity of days’); **ከዊነ፡ አምላክና** “the becoming God” (*conversio in Deum*); **ከዊነ፡ ሥርጽና** “the condition or quality of the Procession” (viz. ‘of the Holy Ghost’); **ዘለዓለምና** “eternity”. Such words are derived even from Infinitives: **ተከልሶትና** “canine nature”; **ትህይድና** “the condition of being robbed” (**ተህይድ**); **ትምስውና** “faint-heartedness”; —and from Plural forms: **አምላክና** “Deity”; **አይሁድና** “Judaism”. **ቊልዕውና** “boyhood” from **ቊልዕ** is a formation noteworthy by reason of the type it presents, inasmuch as the ending *ē* is here resolved into *ew*⁽²⁾.—Instead of *nā*, *nāt* (with the fem. **ት**) appears in two instances: **ግብርናት** “slavery” (from **ግብር**) and **ርስዕናት** “godlessness” (from **ርስዕ**) Hen. 99, 1 (104, 9 Note)⁽³⁾.

Diminutives have no special form in Ethiopic, and have therefore to be described by circumlocution, *e. g.* **በግዕ፡ ንኡስ** “a lambkin” (*lit.* ‘a little lamb or sheep’) Hen. 89, 48.

Compound words do not occur in the domain of conceptional words. It is true that the constituent parts of some very common Word-Groups and of Proper names are written together as one word, without being separated by points, like **እግዚአብሔር** “the Supreme” (properly: ‘Lord of the earth’); **እመሕያው** “mother of the living”; **አባጉንባሕ** “horn-bill” (Deut. 14, 18 جَنْبُ crassus, longus),—though, on the other hand, **መዓረ፡ ግራ** “wax”—(*lit.* ‘sweetness of the comb’); **ፕፒራ፡ ለይ** “scarlet”—(*lit.* ‘purple or

No Special form for Diminutives; nor any true Compounds.

(1) So too **ምዕስብና** from **ማዕሰብ**, and **ምዕቅብና** from **ማዕቀብ**.

(2) The word **በዝግና** “necklace” is difficult to explain.

(3) According to HALÉVY, ‘*Revue crit.*’, 1885, No. 13, p. 247 the terminations *-nā*, *-nāt* must have made their way into Ge‘ez from the Agau.

scarlet of the berry'); but, inasmuch as the first word shows the regular type of the Construct state, these combinations cannot rank as true Compounds. Yet in stray Multiliteral Nominal Stems, Compound words or Compound roots seem to be met with, *e. g.* in **ደንበኩል** “wild-beasts’ cage”, “lasso” and **ሰንሰቀ** “silk” (the latter part of which is = **سَرَق**). Noteworthy also are **ሰጉሮ** “leek” (of which the latter part = **قِرْط**) and **ሶጉታሮ** “aloe”.

PARTICIPLES AND INFINITIVES.

Participles:
General
Remarks:
Comparative
Failure of
Regular
Participial
Forms.

§ 123. The foregoing account shows that special types exist in Ethiopic for each separate Verbal Stem, according to which it might form its own *Participle*:—the types namely of the Active and Passive Participles, described in §§ 109, *a* and 108, *c*, for St. I, 1; those which are formed by prefixing **መ** (§§ 114 and 118) for St. I, 2, 3, II, 1—3, IV, 1—3 of the Tri-radical roots, and St. I, II, IV and V of the Multiliteral; and those which are described in § 117 for the Reflexive Stems III of Triliteral and Multiliteral verbs, as well as for a few other Stems. Yet we can hardly designate all these types as Participles proper, for they by no means admit of being derived from every verb. It depends always upon the usage of the language whether, in the case of the several verbs, Participle-resembling forms,—and which of them,—have been established and retained. These forms, besides, have in most cases lost the force of a pure Participle, and have become either Adjectives or *Nomina Agentis*. This explains also why so many of them have taken the external termination **፤** (§ 117 *sq.*). Besides, special types of the Participle Passive have almost entirely disappeared in all Derived Stems of Active meaning, with the general decay of the inner Passive formation—(yet *v.* §§ 111, *b*; 114 *ad fin.*):—Such Stems were forced to have recourse to the Simple Stems, when the purpose was to form Participles of Passive meaning (*cf.* §§ 108, 111, *b*; 112, *b*). Even the Participle which occurs the most frequently of all,—*viz.* the Passive Part. of the Simple Stem—, by no means continues to be formed from every root. This failure in Ethiopic of a regular Participial formation

was fomented (1) by the peculiar use of the Infinitive (§ 181), through which the Participle could in many cases be replaced, as for instance in **ወሐዊሮሙ፡ ይጥቅዱ** “and going, or as they go (*lit*: ‘in their going’), they shall sound the trumpets” Josh. 6, 8; **በጸሐ፡ ወሂኦ** “he arrived, after he had come forth” Josh. 10, 9—, and (2) by the rise of a practice of indicating the Participial conception by periphrasis in a finite tense. The defect, inherent in the Semitic Participle, of being attached to no sphere of time, was thus compensated, in the course of striving to be clear, by the language gradually coming to represent the Participle through a periphrasis in the proper tense-forms.

The case is quite otherwise with the Ethiopic *Infinitive*. It is regularly formed from all the separate Stems, and in fact not merely in one type but in several. The Infinitive expresses the pure conception of the action of the Verb without distinction of tenses or persons, and to that extent it ranges itself alongside of the Abstract Nominal Stems or Conceptional words; but, on the other hand, it partakes of the Verbal character in respect that it conforms to the Verb throughout all the Stems, and produces as many forms as there are Stems in it, and also in respect that it is capable of having Objects of its own. In consequence of possessing this twofold nature, it inclines, in the different Semitic languages, sometimes to the Noun, sometimes to the Verb,—more to the Noun, in Arabic for instance,—more to the Verb, in Hebrew. In this matter Ethiopic has taken a course of its own by constructing different types for the Infinitive in its different functions. It has Infinitive-forms which possess completely the power and independent character of a Noun. They may enter into all relations in a sentence which are open to a Noun, may become Subject or Object, may subordinate to themselves other Nouns in the Genitive case⁽¹⁾, may have themselves preceded by Prepositions or by other words in the Construct state, may be specially determined by an Adjective (*e. g.* **ብዙኅ፡ ዘምዖ**⁽²⁾ Hen. 8, 2), or may even,—like

Compensated partly
1.—By the Gerund;
2.—By Periphrasis in a Finite Tense.

Infinitives:
Distinction between Nominal Infinitive and Verbal Infinitive or Gerund.

⁽¹⁾ They do not so often subordinate to themselves objects in the accusative, after the pattern of their verbs: *e. g.* Gen. 6, 7; Deut. 5, 22.

⁽²⁾ [FLEMMING, ‘*Das Buch Henoch*’, reads in this passage **ወከነ፡ ርከዓን፡ ዐቢይ፡ ወብዙኅ፡ ወዘመወ**—, instead of DILLMANN’S reading **ወከነ፡ ርከዐት፡ ዐቢይ፡ ወብዙኅ፡ ዘምዖ**—, thus referring the adjective **ብዙኅ**

the Hebrew Infinitive Absolute or the Arabic *Mutlaq*⁽¹⁾,—be subordinated in the Accusative to their own Verb by way of special qualification. But from this *Nominal Infinitive*, as we shall henceforth call it, Ethiopic distinguishes, by a special form, the *Verbal Infinitive*, which stands closer to the Verb, and which we, following the Latin terminology, shall call the *Gerund*. Of course, being an Infinitive, it has the form of a Noun, and as such may have an Accusative. It does not, however, take the place of a noun, but that of a verb, and properly it is nothing else than the verb deprived of Tense⁽²⁾. It occurs only as a special qualification to a finite verb, which contains the principal action of the sentence, and it is subordinated to that verb in the accusative for the purpose of adding a secondary action. As the time of the secondary or accompanying action is determined by the tense of the principal verb, the secondary action is given without any time-form, that is, it is put in the Infinitive. But it is exactly like an ordinary verb in being obliged to enclose within itself the acting Subject, while it is completed after the manner of other Nouns by a Suffix pronoun, which in this case always is to be regarded as a Subject Genitive, *e. g.*: ወሰላም፡ ንጉሥ፡ ደንገፀ “and at his hearing, the king was filled with terror”, *i. e.* “when the king heard (it), he was struck with terror”; ደጥቆ፡ ሐዊሮሙ “they shall blow the trumpets, in their going”, *i. e.* “they shall sound the trumpets as they go”. We might call this Infinitive also the Infinitive Absolute, just as in other languages we speak of a Participle Absolute. By means of the formation of this Infinitive, Ethiopic diction has gained a peculiar brevity and grace; but the similar employment of the Infinitive Absolute in Hebrew and of the Infinitive Construct with ל in cases like וַיֹּאמֶר לְאֶמֶר—shows that in this it has merely developed a capability which underlies the Infinitive in other Semitic languages too⁽³⁾.

to the foregoing noun, and reading the last word as a finite verb, 3rd pl. Perf. TR.]

(¹)[—the “objective complement, which is called by the Arab grammarians

الْبَفْعُولُ الْمُبْتَطَقُ, the absolute object”, WRIGHT’s ‘*Ar. Gramm.*’ 3rd ed. vol. II (Cambridge 1898), p. 54 C. TR.]

(²) In some of the cases cited in EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 280, *a, b*, it is paralleled by the Infinitive Absolute in Hebrew.

(³) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 280, *d*.

§ 124. A few Abstract forms, of those which have been described already among the Nominal Stems, may be used readily for the Infinitive, at least for the Nominal Infinitive, seeing that it is merely a Conceptional Word or Abstract, derived from the Verb. Several of those Abstract forms, in fact, are ordinary forms of the Infinitive in the other Semitic languages. In particular, the forms, described in § 111, *a*, α & β , may directly supply the place of an Infinitive, as also may the Feminine formations in § 106, *e. g.* **መተት** “to die” (Gen. 35, 18), **በክት** “to enter” (Matt. 19, 24), and several other forms, *e. g.* **ምብዋእ** “to come” (Josh. 13, 5). *Cf.* also: **ግብክትዩ** (Luke 10, 35), **ፀክቶሙ** Ex. 5, 20, **ምልክክክ**: **ኩሎ** Sap. 12, 16, **ኅፈርኩ**: **ስእለቶ**: **ለንጉሥ**: **ኅይለ**: **ወሰራዊት** 2 Esr. 8, 22, **መዋዕለ**: **ፅንሳ**: **ኪያሁ** (F. N.). For the Infinitive proper the language has meanwhile contrived special Abstract-formations, which very seldom indeed have become actual Nouns. At the same time this distinction has been established between the two classes of Infinitives, viz. that the Gerund invariably takes an inner formation only, while the Nominal Infinitive takes outer Abstract-terminations, just as they are used with Nominal Stems.

Certain Abstract forms sometimes employed for the Nominal Infinitive.

1. *The formation of the Gerund* conforms to the type which is described in § 109, *b* (*cf.* therewith § 106). It is contrived by inserting after the second-last radical a long and accented *ī*, which in the last resort is connected with the *ē* of the Subjunctive of Transitive verbs.

Formation of the Infinitive Proper:—
1. *The Gerund* in the several Stems.

In St. I, 1 of the Tri-radical verb the first radical,—in accordance with § 109, *b*—, has always the vowel *a*, and the form runs: **መተር** (*matír*)⁽¹⁾ “to cut”, **በለዕ** “to eat”, **ኅሊፍ** “to go on”, **ኅዲግ** “to abandon”, **ቀተል** “to kill”, **ዐቀላር** “to bind together”. No difference is made between Verbs of transitive and those of intransitive pronunciation. In roots *mediae gutturalis* the *a* of the first radical is always dulled into *ē*: **ምሒር** “to pity”, **ድኒን** “to escape”, **ጠሂል** “to say”, **ከሂል** “to be able”; **ስኢን** “to be unable”, **ስኢል** “to ask”, **ግዲር** “to moan”, **ኦኒዝ** “to take”, **ግሒሥ** “to turn to”. The form from roots *med. gem.* is always resolved: **ነቢብ** “to speak”, **ሐተት** “to search into”, **ገሒስ** “to touch”. With

(1) *Cf.* TRUMPP, p. 540.—In Tigriña, according to SCHREIBER, § 88, the Gerund even with Suffixes has always the accent on the first syllable.

roots *primae vocalis* the stronger form is made use of: **ወሊድ** “to give birth to”, **ወሂኦ** “to go forth”, **ወሪቅ** “to spit”; and in those which are in addition *med. guttur.*: **ውሂብ** “to give”, **ውሒዝ** “to flow”, **ውኒጥ** “to devour”. Roots middle *ū* take always the strong form: **ነዊም** “to sleep”, **ቀዊም** “to stand”, **ሐዊር** “to go”, **በዊኦ** “to come”, **መዊቅ** “to become hot” Job 6, 17. Those with middle *ī* either do the same (in older Manuscripts frequently), *e. g.* **መዩጥ** “to turn”, **ገዩስ** “to be up early”, or follow, as they more usually do, the type given in § 52: **መይጥ** (*mayét*, *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 540), **ገይስ**, **ወይም** “to set”, **ሀይድ** “to rob”, **በይት** “to pass the night”, **ሐይው** “to live”. Roots final *ū* also take the strong form: **ተሊው** “to follow”, **ዐዲው** “to pass over”; those with final *ī* maintain here and there, it is true, the strong form as in **ዐሂይ** “to rot” Acts 12, 23, [**ፈሬይ** “to bear fruit” *Kebra Nag.* 106 a 10], and particularly when, by appending a case-vowel or suffix pronoun, the last radical is drawn to the syllable following;—but usually the type in § 52 is reproduced: **ሰትይ** (*satéyye*) “to drink”, [with suff. pron. **ሰቲዮሙ**, *Kebra Nag.* 138 b 2], **በልይ** “to become antiquated”, **ሐቅይ** “to gnash the teeth”, **ወድይ** “to lay or place”, **ፈድይ** “to pay back”; so with those roots which are at the same time *med. guttur.*: **ውዕይ** “to burn”, **ርኣይ** “to see” (with suffix pron. also **ርኣዮ**⁽¹⁾ Hen. 107, 3 [*cf.* *Kebra Nag.* p. XVI]); but **ጣዕዮ**: **ነፍስ** Sir. 30, 16; and so with roots which are at the same time *med. gem.*: **ጐይይ** “to flee” Hen. 52, 7.

In St. II, 1 the first radical, as in the Subjunctive, is always bound to the prefixed Stem-sign **ኦ** in one syllable, with the vowel *a* between; the second has *ī*; and in roots with final *ī* the peculiar formation of St. I, 1 is repeated. Examples:—**ኦኦሚር** “to know”, **ኦኦኩት** “to thank”, “to give thanks”, **ኦስሐት** “to corrupt” Hen. 19, 2, **ኦስቲት** “to neglect”, Hebr. 2, 3, **ኦንሂው** “to wither” Ps. 89, 6, **ኦሕኒጽ**, **ኦውሢኦ**, **ኦግሪር**, **ኦቢት**, **ኦኒኅ**; **ኦቂም** from **ኦቀመ**; **ኦኒም** from **ኦነመ** &c.

In St. III, 1, after the Personal sign of the Subjunctive has been removed, the Stem-Preformative and the first radical take each the vowel *a*, and the second radical takes *ī*: in other respects the peculiarities of roots middle *ī* and final *ī* (and those of guttural or

(¹) [Instead of **ርኣዮ** FLEMING reads, in his edition of *Henoch*, in this passage, **ወኦርኦዮ**. TR.]

aspirate roots) are repeated: **ተመሊኦ** “to be fulfilled”, **ተዘረኦ** “to be sown”, **ተነፈር** “to be ashamed”, **ተመደጥ** “to be turned, converted” Luke 22, 32, but also **ተመደጠከ** G. Ad. 17, 8 [and **ተመደጠከሙ** *Kebra Nag.* 120 b 22], **ተፈቲው** “to long for” Numb. 16, 15, **ተመሰው** 2 Pet. 3, 11, **ተገዘም**, **ተገዘር**, **ተመዋኦ**, **ተጠሚቅ**, **ተጠሚዕ**, **ተሠሪዎ** Chrest. 72, 1; *mediae gutturalis*: **ተግሒሥ** “to withdraw (*intr.*)”, **ተእኒዝ** Sap. 14, 16, [*Kebra Nag.* 135 a 24]; and from **ተምዕዕ**, **ተምሒዕ** “to be angry”. In St. IV, 1 the first radical has the same pronunciation as in the Subjunctive: **አስተፍሢኦ** “to rejoice”, **አስተብሪክ** “to bend the knees”. The Infinitive-forms, besides, of Stems II, 1, III, 1 and IV, 1, which upon the whole do not occur so often as those of St. I, 1, are not yet sufficiently well supported.

In like manner the Infinitive of the Intensive Stem has hitherto been but seldom met with in the form I, 2; but it may be easily formed from the Subjunctive, which has always *a* after the first radical, modified into *e* in the case of roots *med. guttur.* It is distinguished from the Infinitive of I, 1 merely by the doubling of the middle radical: **ነጸር** “to perceive”, “to behold” 2 Cor. 5, 19, **ፈጸም** “to finish” John 17, 4, **ከኒን** “to rule over” Esth. 3, 14, l. 4 *Apcr.*; **ምሂር** “to teach”. Even from roots middle *i* it is formed just as in the case of I, 1: **ጠይቅ** “to know exactly” Ps. 21, 18, Jas. 1, 24, [along with **ጠይቅ**, v. *Kebra Nag.*, p. XVII]. Of still less frequent occurrence is the Infinitive of II, 2, *e. g.* **አዘከር** “to recall to memory”, **አመከር** “to test” 1 Cor. 11, 28. That of St. III, 2 is more common: **ተደሚር** “to be united” Hen. 19, 1, **ተመከር** “to be tempted”, **ተሠረው** “to become flesh” *Hymnol. Musei Brit.*, and so too **ተዐሪዝ**, **ተገሢጽ**, **ተዐረሥ**, **ተደሊው**, **ተገፊዕ**, **ተወከል**; from roots *med. guttur.*: **ተልሢል** “to be exalted” Ps. 87, 16, **ተምሂር** “to be instructed”, **ተጽሢር** “to be tortured”, **ተጽሢን** “to ride”⁽¹⁾. From St. IV, 2, *e. g.*: **አስተኅይስ** “to prefer” (*Encom.*).

The Infinitive of the Influencing-Stem has not yet been vouched for in St. I, 3 or II, 3, but it could without doubt be formed. From St. III, 3 we have:—**ተጋበኦ** “to be assembled together”, **ተላህይ** “to play”, **ተሳይጥ** “to buy” Gen. 43, 2, **ተማ**

(1) Cf. also: **ተሥኢን** Eph. 6, 15; **ተዐዊር** Numb. 5, 6; **ተፈኒው** 2 Pet. 1, 21; **ተሰፊው** Hebr. 11, 1; **ተከኒን** Hebr. 11, 35; **ተፈሢኦ** Ps. 64, 11.

ኪር “to take counsel together” Matt. 27, 7, **ተዋቂሥ** “to contend” Job 35, 2, **ተኬንዎ** for **ተኬኒዎ** “to fabricate with skill” Sap. 13, 11: From St. IV, 3: **አስተሐሚዎ** “to tire one’s self out” Luke 15, 8, **አስተዳሊው** “to prepare” Josh. 9, 2⁽¹⁾.

From Multiliteral Roots: St. I: **ቀጥቂጥ** “to break in pieces”, “to crush” Luke 9, 39, **ማሲን** “to perish”, **ጐድጐድ** “to knock” Luke 12, 36, **ተርጉም** “to interpret”, **ደንጊሪ** “to be terrified”, **ገንጺል** “to distort”, **ዋቂሕ** “to put in fetters”, **ቶሲሕ** “to mix”, (*Gadla Lālibalā*, ed. PERRUCHON, Paris 1892, p. 39, l. 19), **ጐንድይ** “to linger or tarry” Matt. 25, 5, **ዒዊው** “to take captive” Eph. 4, 8; Ps. 67, 19: St. II:—**አመንዲብ** “to reduce to distress”, [**አመክዲብ** “to double” *Kebra Nag.* 96 a 3], **አናሕሲይ** (with Suff. Pron.) “to forgive” 2 Cor. 5, 19, **አሰሰል** “to remove” Chrest. 73, 7 [**አፈድፊድ** and **አፈድፍድ** “to add” *Kebra Nag.* 12 b 16 & var.]: St. III:—**ተመንዲብ** “to be brought into distress”, **ተመርጉዝ** “to lean upon”, **ተቶሲሕ** “to be mixed”, **ተዋቂሕ** “to be put in fetters”; **ተገልበብ** “to be veiled”, **ተዒዊው** “to be taken captive”, **ተጐናዲይ** “to be deferred”, **ተዜያኒው** “to recount to one another” *Gad. Lālib.* 39, 12: St. V:—**አንጦሊዕ** “to spread out”, **አንቃዕዲው** “to be devout”, **አንጠብጠብ** “to drop”, **አንገሊግ** “to assemble together”, “to keep company with” 1 Cor. 5, 4.

2. The
Nominal
Infinitive

in the several
Stems.

§ 125. 2. *The Nominal Infinitive* usually has a special form. It is true that in the Simple Ground-Stem the form described in § 124 serves also for cases in which the Infinitive is used rather as a Noun, and it is employed in that meaning far oftener than the special Nominal Infinitive-form, though that form can be framed from this stem too. But in the remaining Stems the Substantive-use of that first form is exceedingly rare. In all these Stems the Nominal Infinitive much prefers to assume a special form, contrived by means of an outer Abstract-termination. Even St. I, 1 may take a form of the same kind. The termination employed is *ōt*, or in abbreviated guise *ō*, § 121, and it always has the accent (TRUMPP, p. 540). The formation itself in St. I, 1 is different from that which prevails in the other Stems.

In St. I, 1 *ōt* is simply attached as an Abstract-termination to the type of the Gerund, *e. g.* from **ሐኒጽ** “to build”, **ሐኒጽት**. In the same way:—**ዐቂቦት** “to preserve” Ps. 18, 12, **አሚኖት** “to

⁽¹⁾ Other examples are found in Ex. 18, 16, and Deut. 11, 14.

believe" Matt. 13, 58, **ረዲአት** "to help" Ps. 21, 20, **ኅሢዎት** "to seek", **ነቢዮት** "to speak", **ወሪዶት** "to come down" Hen. 63, 10, **ሰዊቶት** "to support", **ተሊዎት** "to follow" John 13, 36, **ገሲሶት**, **ጠፊሐት**, **ዘሪዎት**, **ጸቢአት**, **ከሢቶት** Gen. 48, 10, Rev. 5, 3, **አሲሮት** Matt. 12, 29, **ዐዊዶት** Deut. 2, 3, **ዘጊሶት** Tob. 12, 8, **ተከሊሎት** Numb. 7, 1, **ገቢአት** Deut. 17, 16, **ኅቢአት** Ex. 2, 3, **በዊአት** 1 Kings 7, 13, Sir. 42, 6: *mediae gutturalis*:—**ምሂኮት** "to spare", **ክሂሎት** "to be able", **ስኢኖት** "not to be able", **እኒዞት** "to take", **ርእዮት** "to see", **ርሒቶት** "to recoil".—With radical *ī* in the middle:—**ገይሶት** "to be early up" Ps. 126, 3, **ከይዶት** "to tread" Hen. 4, but also in an abbreviated form **ከዶት** G. Ad. 22, 11, **ሚጦት** "to turn" *Org.* With *ī* as final radical: **ኅርዮት** "to choose", **ዐስዮት** "to requite". This Nominal Infinitive-form of the first Stem is, however, almost never used except when Suffix pronouns are applied. For seeing that in accordance with § 123 the verbal form with suffix pronoun has the force of a Gerund (*e. g.* in **ዐቂቦሙ** "in their keeping" or "by their keeping", **ጣዕዮ** Sir. 30, 16), the language distinguishes by a special form those cases in which the Infinitive with Suff. pron. is not to have that sense, so that, *e. g.* **ዐቂቦቶሙ** means "their keeping", *i. e.* either "the fact that they keep", or—"the fact that they are kept". The abbreviated form in *ō* does not belong to Stem I, 1⁽¹⁾.

The *remaining Stems* of the Triliteral roots and all the Stems of the Multiliterals form their Nominal Infinitive from the Subjunctive⁽²⁾ by throwing off the personal sign and attaching the Abstract-termination *ōt* or *ō*, the *a* of the second radical being replaced in the Reflexive Stems by *e*; *ī* is very rarely met with after the second radical. Between Forms in *ōt* and in *ō* there is no difference in meaning, but merely a phonetic difference originally. The shortened form of expression—*ō* is employed when there is no special reason calling for the other form, and it is then retained even⁽³⁾ when the Infinitive enters the Construct state, as in **አምልኮ፡ ጣዖት** "idolatry" ('the worshipping of an idol'), **አእምሮ፡ ተአምራት** Sap. 8, 8, **አእምሮ፡ ፍኖቱ** 1 Esr. 2, 11, **ተዒውዎ፡ አዋልድዮ** Bar. 4, 10. The original and longer form in *ōt* regularly

(¹) Yet v. Deut. 15, 10 **ውሂቦ**.

(²) V., however, KÖNIG, p. 163.

(³) Differing in this from Aramaic.

appears before the Suff. Pron. as in **ስእነ፡ አመክሮተከ** “he could not tempt thee”, and it is also occasionally used besides instead of the shortened form, particularly when it is required to denote clearly the Construct state or the Accusative,—which cannot be distinguished in the other form. Neither of the two forms—*ōt*, *ō*—can be used in the sense of a Gerund.

Stem I, 2: **ነጽሮ** “to look”, **ኣብሶ** “to transgress”, **ነስሐ** (*nas-sehō*) “to feel penitent”, **ኩንኖ** “to give judgment”, **ጠቦ** “to be wise”, **ወልጦ** “to exchange”, **ወርዖ** “to throw”, **የብቦ** “to exult”, **የውሆ** “to be gentle”, **ጠይቆ** “to search closely”, **ጎልዮ** “to reflect upon”, **ጸልዮ** “to pray”, **ሐስዖ** “to lie”, **ሀልዖ** “to be”; but *mediae gutturalis*: **ምሀሮ** “to teach” 1 Cor. 9, 14. With *ōt*: **ነጽሮት**, **ወልጦት**, **ዘምዖት**, **ሀልዖት** Chrest. 45, 20, **ምሀሮት** ⁽¹⁾ &c.

Stem I, 3: **ባርኮ** and **ባርኮት** “to bless”, **ሣርሮ** and **ሣርሮት** “to found”, **ላሕዖ** and **ላሕዖት** “to lament”.

Causative Stems:—St. II, 1: **አፍቅሮ** and **አፍቅሮት** “to love”, **አስሕቶ** “to seduce”, **አርምዋ** “to be tranquil”, **አእምሮ** “to know”, **አውጎዶ** “to make few or small”, **አጥርዮ** “to take possession of”, **አርጎዎ** “to open”, **አርውዮ** “to water”, **አጥፍኦት**, **አጥዕዮት**, **አምዕዶ**, **አርውጾ** G. Ad. 116, 11, **አሞኦት**, **አሞቶት**, **አሕውሶ** and **አሐሶ** Sap. 5, 11, **አቢቶ** 1 Kings 3, 3; but **አቅዋ** and **አቅዋት** “to place”, **አንዋ**, **አንኖ**, **አብኦ**. St. II, 2: **አለብዎ** and **አለብዎት** “to instruct”, **አሐልዮ** “to remind”, **አሰስሎ** “to remove”, **አመክሮ** Judith 8, 26, **አሠንዮት** Chrest. 44, 28, **አበይኖት፡ ነዋኃት** G. Ad. 23, 8 ⁽²⁾; *mediae gutturalis*: **አልዕሎ** “to exalt”, **አትሕቶ** “to humiliate”. St. II, 3: **አላቅሶ** and **አላቅሶት** “to show sympathy”.

Reflexive Stems:—St. III, 1: **ተለብሶ** and **ተለብሶት** “to dress”; *mediae gutturalis*: **ተርጎዎ** “to open (*neut.*)”; **ተንሥኦ** and **ተንሥኦት** from **ተንሥኦ** “to rise, to be raised”; **ተሰዶ**, **ተሰድዶ** and **ተሰድዶት** “to be expelled”; **ተሀይዮ** and **ተሀይዮት** “to neglect”; **ተመይጦ** Chrest. 44, 28 “to turn (*neut.*)”, **ተመውኦ**, **ተመውኦት** and **ተመዊኦት** “to be conquered”; **ተቀንዮ** “to serve”; **ተርእዮ** “to appear”; **ተሰጥዎ** “to answer”; **ተወቅሮ** and **ተወቅሮት** “to be hewn”; **ተፈልጦ** Chrest. 44, 24; G. Ad. 11, 19; 127, 16; **ተመርሐ** Chrest. 44, 26; **ተወርዖት** G. Ad. 24, 8; **ተጠብቦ** Prov. 8, 5; **ተደሞ**

⁽¹⁾ V., besides, Deut. 31, 27, Note.

⁽²⁾ Yet v. **አስፍዎት** Gal. 3, 8, 18, with transition from II, 2 to II, 1.

G. Ad. 53, 16. St. III, 2: **ተሐድሶ** and **ተሐድሶት** “to be renewed”; **ተአዝዞ** “to obey”; **ተሠግዎ** “to become flesh”; **ተጠይቆ** and **ተጠይቆት** “to make one’s self certain”; **ተዐግሦ** and **ተዐግሦት** “to refrain”; **ተፈውሶ**; *mediae gutturalis*: **ተልዕሎ**, **ተትሕቶ**, **ተይህዶ**, **ተምዕዎ** and **ተምዎ**; and in both Stems with roots which are both *primae* and *mediae gutturalis*: **ተአጎዎ** “brotherly bearing”, **ተአጎዞት** “to be continued”. St. III, 3: **ተናግሮ** and **ተናግሮት** “to converse together”; **ተሣህሎ**, **ተቃንኦ**; **ተያውሆ**; **ተዛውዎት** Chrest. 45, 26; **ተላህዮት** G. Ad. 123, 12; **ተንሕልዎት** *ibid.* 136, 28 &c.

Causative-Reflexive Stems. In St. IV, 1 the two modes of pronouncing the Perfect (§ 98) again make their appearance: **አስተብሑዎ** and **አስተብሑዎት**; **አስተርእዮ** and **አስተርእዮት**; **አስተከብዶ**, **አስተከብዶት** and **አስተክብዶ**. St. IV, 2: **አስተዐግሦ** and **አስተዐግሦት**; **አስተጎይሶ** and **አስተጎይሶት**. St. IV, 3: **አስተጋብኦ** and **አስተጋብኦት**; **አስተሓወዞ**; **አስተሓይጸ**; **አስተታልዎ**; **አስተፋቅዶ** Numb. 26, 63; [**አስተጣግዎ** *Kebra Nag.* 50 a 1.].

Multiliteral Roots:—St. I: **ቤዝዎ** and **ቤዝዎት**, **ዐውይዎ** and **ዐውይዎት**, **ቀጥቅጦ** and **ቀጥቅጦት**, **ዘርክዮት**, **ገንጽሎት**; St. II: **አመንድቦ** and **አመንድቦት**, **አማኅብሮ**, **አማስኖ**, **አጻዕድዎ** and **አጻዕድዎት**, **አስቆቅዎ** G. Ad. 137, 22 and **አስቆቅዎት** *ibid.* 108, 12; 135, 19; 137, 21, **አመክንዮ**; **አድለቅልቆ**, **አርመስምሶ**; St. III, 1: **ተመንድቦ** and **ተመንድቦት**, **ተዲውዎ**, **ተኦንስሶ**, **ተማሕፅኖ**, **ተራህርሆ**, **ተሰርግዎ**; **ተኦንተልትሎ**; St. III, 3: **ተሰናክሎ** and **ተሰናክሎት**, **ተሰናክዎ**, **ተወላውሎ**; [St. IV, 3: **አስተጠናቅቆ** *Kebra Nag.* 55 b 23]; St. V: **አንቀልቅሎ** Chrest. 76, 1 and **አንቀልቅሎት**, **አንሶስዎ** and **አንሶስዎት**, **አንሶጥጦ**, **አንሳሕስሐ**, **አንገርግሮት**, **አንጌግዮ**.

II. FORMATION OF GENDERS AND NUMBERS.

1. GENDERS OF NOMINAL STEMS.

§ 126. Semitic languages have long since given up the distinction between a Personal and a Non-Personal (or Neuter) in objects of perception and representation⁽¹⁾. Thanks to a lively imagination, the Semites have rather conceived every thing that exists as being alive, and have ranked it under one or other of the contrasted conditions of Masculine and Feminine, natural to every-

The Two
Genders:
Masculine
and
Feminine.
Signs of the
Feminine.

(1) V. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 172, a.

thing which exhibits life. Even inanimate objects, facts and ideas are thought of as either masculine or feminine, or both together, just in accordance with the view which the genius of a people has taken of them severally. Like the rest of these languages Ethiopic knows only the two genders. To express what other languages regard as Neuter, the Feminine gender may, it is true, appear in Semitic tongues, inasmuch as that gender is the more feebly personal one, compared with the Masculine⁽¹⁾:—In fact pure ideas (Abstracts) are usually conceived of as procreative and productive powers, and are therefore expressed in the Feminine form. But on the other hand, there are also many facts (or things) and ideas, which do not impress the mind as being so decidedly weak and feminine as to call for an expressly feminine designation. Their names accordingly remain without any special feminine marking; and seeing that the Masculine gender,—as will immediately be shown,—is similarly unprovided with a special marking, these names, as regards outward form, coincide with entities, concerns and notions, which are decidedly regarded as Masculine. Thus it comes about that both Masculine and Feminine serve to replace the Neuter of other languages. And this is shown not only in the Stem-formation of Substantives, but also when the Neuter of Adjectives or Demonstratives has to be expressed in Ethiopic. For this purpose sometimes the Masculine, sometimes the Feminine is used,—more frequently the former however, and particularly in the class of Demonstratives, and in that of words compounded with Prepositions, *e. g.*:—**ዝውእቱ** “that is”, **ከመዝ** “such (a thing)” Matt. 9, 33, **ከማሁ** “such” Josh. 11, 15, **ዝንቱ** “this” Ps. 41, 4; 61, 11, **እምድኅረ፡ ዝንቱ** “after this” Josh. 24, 30, **ወምስለ፡ ዝኒ፡ ዓዲ** “besides this”; **እሙንቱ** “the same things” Matt. 15, 18, **ኩሉ** “all” Josh. 23, 14. More rarely the Fem. is found, *e. g.* **ኮነት፡ ዛቲ** “this happened”, or the two together: **ወበዝ፡ ባሕቲታ** “and only herein” Gen. 34, 22, **ዛ** “this” Ex. 17, 14. Even in the case of Adjectives the Masc. is often sufficient:—**ኄር** “the good” (*or* “what is good”) Matt. 19, 17, **ብዙኅ፡ ባዕድ** “much besides” 2 Cor. 11, 28, **እኩይ** “evil”, “what is evil” Ps. 33, 14, **ግሩም** “what is terrible” Ps. 105, 22, **ሠናይ** “what is good” Ps. 24, 14, **ቀዳሚ** “that which is first” (occurring very frequently). But the Fem. also occurs often:—**ሠናይት** “(any)

(1) *Cf.* **ጠባዊት** “suckling”.

good thing", "well-being" Josh. 21, 43; Hen. 20, 5, **ዛቲ፡ ዕጽብት** "this troublesome matter" Ex. 10, 7, **ተባዕት፡ ወአንስት** "male and female" Gen. 1, 27; Mark 10, 6, **እኩት፡ ህዩንተ፡ ሠናይ** "evil for good" Gen. 44, 4, 6; *cf.* also **ስሕክት፡ ብዙኅ** "much roughness"—Chr. Hom. 30. When the Neuter comprises much detail, the plural is generally employed, taking usually the Masculine gender with a Pronoun, and the Feminine in case of an Adjective: **ዐቢያት** "great things", "what is great" Ps. 105, 22, **ሐዲሳት** "what was new" Hen. 106, 13, (*cf.* *Gadla 'Aragāwī* 6 a 1: GUIDI, 1895), **ዕጽብት** "what is astonishing" Gen. 49, 3, **ኅቡአት፡** "what is secret" Ps. 43, 23, **ቅድስተ፡ ቅዱሳን** "the holiest of all" Hebr. 9, 3 &c.

As regards *the denotation of the two Genders*, the *Masculine* has no special termination. Its distinctive sign consists merely in the absence of the Feminine termination. The *Feminine* has for sign a termination which is applied to the Stem, and which originally had the sound *at*⁽¹⁾. In Ethiopic, however, just as in the other Semitic languages, this termination has experienced several phonetic changes. On the one hand the *t*-sound is obscured into a mere breathing, under the influence of which the *a* is lengthened into an unalterable *ā*, (only rarely changed into *āt*), the breathing itself disappearing (§ 47)⁽²⁾. This termination *ā*⁽³⁾ is not the usual one in Ethiopic, it is true, but still it occurs frequently in the class of Nouns derived from Conceptional Roots, and in the Prepositional class:—In one case it has even penetrated into the Stem (§ 129): In a few cases it is still farther dulled into *ē*. On the other hand, by parting with the *a*, the termination *at* is shortened into *t* alone⁽⁴⁾, which attaches itself intimately to the Stem. This termination,—rare in Arabic, more common in Hebrew,—is the ordinary Feminine termination in Ethiopic; and in particular it is employed almost universally in the Feminine form of the Adjective. A farther Feminine termination *ī*, contrasted with the Masculine *ū*, is peculiar to the Pronoun, and will be described along with it.

(1) On the origin of this termination *cf.* EWALD, '*Hebr. Spr.*' § 173, *a*.

(2) But v. PRAETORIUS, '*Amh. Spr.*', p. 167.

(3) Hebr. **תֵּ**, Arab. **ـَ**, Aram. **ܐ**, **ܐ**; v. however ZDMG XV, p. 145.

(4) Just as in the Verb, v. *supra* p. 203, § 101, 2.

Feminine
Endings,
and the
Mode of
their Attach-
ment in the
case of
1. Substan-
tives:—
Ending at.

§ 127. 1. Coming now to points of detail in the use of these terminations and the mode of their attachment to the Stem, we direct attention, in what follows, first to the usage in the case of *Substantives*.

(a) *The full, original termination at* is applied chiefly to the Second simple form, described in § 106, *a*, of Conceptional words of an Infinitive type,—although, even in this class, in certain derivatives from roots *primae vocalis*, the pure consonantal termination *t* has asserted itself (ጥጥት, ቅጥት, ግበት, ሀበት), side by side with other forms of the type ርደት, ርቀት⁽¹⁾. Apart from these, the full ending occurs but rarely now, and that chiefly with Stems of the First simple form (§ 105), in which of course the Feminines in question cannot any longer be distinguished in all cases with accuracy from feminine Abstract-forms which have become Names of things (§ 106):—ጽግነት “bat”, ጽፍነት “traveling-pouch or wallet”, and several others enumerated in § 105, *a. f.*; also ሰመት “garlic” (ጠጥ, ثوم, مسمون); from ግም (§ 105) ግመት “year”; similarly ናቀት “female camel” (ناقة), እመት “ell”, and ዕዕት “shrub” (from ዕዕ “tree”)⁽²⁾. From Stems of the Second simple Abstract-formation (§ 107, *γ*), the Feminine type which,—in contrast to the Predicative words of the same formation (§ 128)—, ends always in the *at* sound, is of very rare occurrence: በረከት “blessing”, ተለወት “succession”. This termination is also met with in other cases, though but seldom; from the form given in § 108, *b*:—ጸሪቀት “cake” (as well as ጸሪቅ), ወዲፈት “lappet”, and an older word ግቢነት “cheese” (ግብነት), shortened into ግብነት; from an Infinitive (§ 109, *b*):—ጎጡኦት “sin” (foreign word?, ጎጥኦ “to sin” Hen. 20, 6); from a Participle (§ 109, *a*):—ሳሪት (for *sāriat*) “spider” (*V*ሳሪ, cf. عَرَاك); from several Common nouns formed from roots *med. gem.* by prefixing መ (§ 116, *a*) in Arabic fashion⁽³⁾:

(1) Cf. PHILIPPI, ‘Beitr. z. Ass.’, II, p. 379.—On the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 540 sq.

(2) On ሰብኦት “relatives” cf. § 121, *d*; ብነት “present” (ጥንታ?) and ግተት “basket” (cf. حَتِي) are of obscure origin: ሐኖት “slaughter-house” is حَانَاة; ቀኖት “sting” is قَنَاقَة (ጥንታ); ወቄት οὐγκία, ወቂያ, ወቂያ, ወቂያ.

(3) EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 484.

መጸለት “tent” (مَظَلَّة); **መሠረት** “foundation” (instead of the strong form **መሥረርት**); **መበለት** “widowhood” (cf. دُولَبَلَى). Of Multiliteral and foreign words we meet with, e. g.: **ጼዳነት** “satyr” (صَيْدَانَة), **መናረት** and **መራናት**, (ጠገንጃ) “candlestick”.

(b) The blunted *Vowel termination* *ā* is in very frequent use to form Abstracts from derived Stems (§ 111, a). These are distinguished, by their heavier termination, from the corresponding forms in *at* coming from the Simple Stem, like **ግብረት**, **ተለወት**. The termination *ā* is on rare occasions found with the Abstract-form from the Simple Stem (§ 106 sq.), and then mostly it interchanges with *at*: **ንትጋ** and **ንትገት** “lack”; **ንፍቃ** and **ንፍቀት** “half”; **ሕንጸ** and **ሕንጸት** “the building” and “the process of building”; as well as **ጉያ** and **ጉየት** “flight”; **ፍታ** (Judges 19, 5, Note) “piece” = **ፍት**; **መሐላ** “oath”. It is employed also now and then to form stronger Abstracts from Nominal Stems of the First simple formation (§ 105): **አምቃ** “salutation”, **ማሕላ** (as well as **መሐላ**) “oath”, **ማውታ** “carcase”, **ለብሐ** “formation”⁽¹⁾. But farther in many Predicative words, of various formations and in many Stems, which from conceptional words have become names of persons or things, especially in those which are foreign or of great antiquity,—the Feminine form in *ā* occurs oftener than the one in *at*. From the First simple formation, § 105: **ሚዓ** “oil of myrrh” (مَيْعَة); **ጻጊ** “ambush” (ጸገ) ⁽²⁾; **ተቅዳ** “coriander” (تَقْدَة); **ዐልዋ** “aloe”; **ቂላ** and **ቂላት** “valley”; **ኖጸ** “sand” (سَرَّة); **ኖራ** “chalk” (فُورَة); **ኮራ** “cup” (كُور); **ጸታ** “row” (ጸጋ, ጸጋ፤); **ቃማ** and **ግማ** “necklace” (جَمَلَة); **ጹና** “perfume”; **ዜማ** “harmony”, “melody”; **ጌራ** “helmet”, “mitre”; **ሄላ** “date-cluster”. With middle *ā* (from *ō*):—**ጣቃ** “darkness” (Vጣጋ); **ናላ** “brain” (cf. نَال and ነገ፤); perhaps also **ጸማ** “toil” (Vጸጣ); **ሓራ** and **ሐራ** “army” (inasmuch as ከ, حَر means first “freeman” and then doubtless “the warrior”⁽³⁾) &c.⁽⁴⁾. From Stems of the formation given in

(1) On **እንግዳ** v. § 137, 4, Note.

(2) Of unknown derivation are:—**ከተሐ** “willow”, **ግራ** “honeycomb”, **ጉማ** “sound” (Sir. 50, 18); on **ጽላ** v. *supra* p. 90, § 47.

(3) It is a corroboration of this, that **ሐራ** now and then means “officer”.

(4) Foreign words:—**ፔሳ** and **ፒሳ** “pitch”, **የውጣ** ἰῶτα, **ረዳ** “rose”, **ራዛ** and **ራዝ** “rice” (ῥυζα); **ጋጋ** “pillory” (ጳ፤); Onomatopoeitic:—**ኳኳ** “raven”, **ጉጋ** and **ጉጓ** [also **ጉጉ**, **ጉጓ** and **ጉጓ** *Kebra Nag.*] “night-jar”.

§ 107, *γ* and others:—**ሐመዳ** “snow” (جَبَد), **ሰቀላ** “tent”; **አነዳ** “skin”; **አገዳ** “withers”, “leg”; **ከበሳ** “bracelet”; **ከተማ** “tip”, “summit”; **ጸደና** “humble-bee” (صَيْدَن); **ሰንኦ** together with **ሰንኦ** “peace”; **መሐዛ** “youth”, “youngster” (perhaps **ደመና**, **ገደላ**, **ከወላ**, **ቀጸላ**, § 111, *a*); **ሰኩና** “sole of the foot” (derived likely from a Pass. Part. of the *V* [נש]). From Stems with **መ** prefixed, § 116, the termination *ā*,—before which the foregoing *a* must be reduced to *e*,—is found, though very seldom:—**ምሀርከ** “booty”, **ምሀላ** “supplication”, **ምጉንጸ** “quiver” (جَعْبَة)⁽¹⁾; **መድብራ** or **መድብራ** “wilderness” seems to be a foreign word (ገጃጃ). From Stems which have *i* after the second radical (§ 108), and from Participles (§ 109, *a*) come several Feminines, much disfigured occasionally: **ከኒሳ** “meeting of a congregation” (كُنَيْسَة); **ሰሊከ** and **ሰሊከ** “casia” (سَلِيكَة); **ብዒዛ** “horn-trumpet”; probably also **ወሬዛ** “youth”, “a young man” (with *ē* from *i*; cf. also KÖNIG, p. 117); **ባቂላ** “bean” (cf. بَاقِلِي); **ጐሪሩ** “punishment”; **ኳሂላ** and **ኳሂላ** “refuse”, “dirt”, “filth” &c. Quite obscure or foreign in origin are **ተኬሳ** “shoulder-blade”; **ሰሊዳ** “table” (σελ/ῥα) &c. This termination is farther in special use in the case of Multiliteral Stems: **ደብተራ** “tent”; **ቀምጠራ** “buckle”; **ደንጉላ** and **ደንጉላት** “lily” (perhaps:—“virgin-like”); **ሰረገላ** “waggon”; **ፈንጸጸ** ‘a bad trouble’; **ድርግሐ** “stuff”, “cloth”; **ዕንቀራ** “cells of bees”; **ድጉልማ** or **ድልጉማ** χλιδών (Sir. 21, 21); **ብርሃና** “parchment”; **ዕንዚራ** “lyre”; **አበርበራ** “nettle”; **አሜከላ** “thorns”. The singular word **አንደባራ** or **አንዳባራ** (Hebr. 12, 8) ὁ ὁφθαλμὸς appears to mean properly “that which turns away from itself”, “that which abandons its own nature” (دبر, ربر), as if it were **አንደባር**, an Adjective derived from St. V; in the same way **አንግድኦ** “breast” (from **ጐድኦ** “to knock”) will be the Fem. of an Adjective formed in accordance with § 112, *b*.

On some Names of plants and Animals, which follow this formation, cf. 131.—On **ዛፍራ** and **ዘብዳ** cf. § 113 (beginning of section). Words also are met with, ending in *yā* (besides those which are explained in § 140), which are to be conceived as Feminine forms of Adjectives &c. with the ending *i* (§ 117 sq.): **ሰፌልያ**

(1) **ምሳፅና** for **ምሳፅንና** belongs to § 122, *β*; **ምዝጋና** “reward” is of obscure origin.

“hammer” (as if from **ሰፈሊ**, $\sqrt{\text{פר}}$); **ሕብልያ** “booty” (‘that which is got through **ሕብል**’); **አስሐትያ** “rime”, “snow”, “hail” — from **አስሐተ** ‘ruining’; **ምጉህያ** “weed” — (‘that which makes waste, or belongs to a waste’, from جَهَى); perhaps also **ጽንጽያ** (for **ጽንጽያ** “a buzzing swarm”, “a fly” *m. & f.*)⁽¹⁾.

(c) It is only very seldom that this \bar{a} takes the duller sound of \bar{e} ⁽²⁾, which seems to belong chiefly to words of the oldest formation. To this class belong first a few words which have *u* as third radical: **ሠርዌ** “beam (of wood)” (*cf.* **سَارِيَّة**); **አርዌ** “beast” (**ሀርዌ**); **ሰርዌ** “army” (*cf.* **سَرِيَّة**)⁽³⁾; then perhaps these Names of Plants: **ትለቤ** “flax” (also, **ሀጌ** “linen”?); **ከርቤ** “myrrh”; **ሀጌ** ‘a kind of tree’ (‘ebony’?); a few names of animals:—**ግጌ** “moth” (**ሞሽ**, **سوس**); **ቀጸጸ** “chamaeleon”; **ነጌ** “elephant” (**ناغا**); **አንቄ** “hawk”; and, besides these, perhaps also **ጊሚ** “fog, mist” (**غَيْم**); **ከሶሴ** “dung” (**فَعَس**); **ግምዒ**⁽⁴⁾ “pitcher”, “can” (Pl. **ግማዕዪ**, like **فَتَاوَى**, **فَتَاوَى**); **ቁሥጤ** (“maw”) “last stomach of ruminants”. *Cf.* also **ማእዜ**, **ጊዜ**, **ዕድሚ**, **አይተ** &c. It is true that as regards several of the words named it is not yet certain whether they do not rather belong to § 118, γ , or to § 120—end⁽⁵⁾.

§ 128. (d). The closely attached, consonantal ending **ት**, before which, in accordance with §§ 35 and 36, a long vowel standing in a closed syllable is regularly shortened, is made use of to form the Feminine, in the greater number of Concrete Nouns which do not take the termination \bar{a} (§ 127). In Stems of the First simple formation it occurs, it is true, only in rare instances:—**ስክተት** “foundation”, along with **ስክተት** (*cf.* **سَكَنَات**); **ሥዕርት** “a hair” (*šē’ért*)⁽⁶⁾; **ኖሃት** “door” (**خَوَاحِش**); **ኩሊት** “kidney” (**كُلَيْة**, **كُلَيْة**);

Ending
 \bar{e} .

Closely
attached
and Con-
sonantal
Ending **ት**.

(1) **ትብልያ**, **ትብሌ**, **ትብላይ** (Ex. 28) “mantle”, “ephod”, seems to be a foreign word (or to be derived from **פֶּלֶשֶׁת**?).

(2) Hebr. **ה**—EWALD, ‘Hebr. Spr.’ §§ 173, *sq.* and 176, *a*; *cf.* also Arab. **حَى**.

(3) Perhaps also **መግዌ** “bunch”.

(4) V. Numb. 19, 17.

(5) As to **ሐቋ** and **ምዳጌ** v. § 21; **ጽሌ** “table” is only a phonetic change for **ጽላ**, *cf.* § 47—beginning.

(6) On the accentuation v. TRUMPF, p. 541.

በገት “daughter” (from **በ**, **بنت**); **እሳት** “sister” (from **እሳ**, **أخت**)⁽¹⁾. From **አንስ** “man” the Fem. is **አንስት** “woman”; from **በግዕ** “sheep”, **በግዕት**; from **አድግ** “ass”, **አድግት** and **እድግት** (Matt. 21, 2; Ex. 13, 13; Numb. 22, 21); cf. also **አውስት** “vulture”. This termination is more frequent in certain Stems of the Second formation:—From Nominal Stems of the types given in § 107, which have taken concrete meanings, occur Feminines like **ክረምት** “winter”, **እጐልት** “cow”, **ግረምት** “terror”, **አጽባዕት** “finger”, **ጸባሕት** “tax”, **ሰማዕት** “testimony”, **ገራህት** “field”, **ተመርት** “palm-tree”, **ፈፀንት** “fever”, **አረፍት** “wall”, **ዐዘቅት** “well”, **በቀልት** “palm-tree”, **ጸበርት** “palm-branch”, **ገሐፍት** “basket”, **ጸሀርት** (as well as **ጽሀርት**) “kitchen-pot”, **ደሴት** “island”. In the same way **ወለት** “daughter” (for **ወለድት** § 54) is Fem. to a word **ገሏ** = **ወለድ**⁽²⁾. Feminines of lost Masculines of the Second simple formation (§ 107 or 108, *a*) from roots *tertiæ infirmæ* either lose completely the last radical, like **አመት** “maid-servant” (**آمة**), or replace it by **ā**, like **ሐማት**⁽³⁾ “mother-in-law” (**أمة**), **ሰዓት** “hour” (also, in abbreviated form, **ሳዕ**), **ለዓት** “hilt” (cf. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’ col. 60), or **እሳት**⁽⁴⁾ “fire”, **ትክት** “antiquity” (root **كُن**, v. § 121 under **ትክቶ**), perhaps also **ስላት** “joy”, “malicious joy”.

From Qualifying or Descriptive words (*i. e.* Adjectives, Participles &c.) of the type in § 108, *c* there arose a number of Feminine substantives, (formed in accordance with § 129, *b*, β): **ልሕኩት** “formation”, **ኅብስት** “bread” (§ 57), **ቅርፍት** “bark”, **ዕቅፍት** “stumbling”, **ዕቅብት** “concubine”, **ሕብቅቅት** *ἀκρασία*, **ኩዕንት** “hardship”, **ንግሥት** “queen” (from **ንጉሥ**), **ሕፂት** “betrothed” (from **ሕፁይ**), **ትክት** (from **ትክእት**) “menstruous”. Also **ነፍስት** “body” (‘having a soul’)⁽⁵⁾, **ሐውልት** “column” (‘turned’) and **ዘብርት** “fragment” are to be reckoned as belonging to this division, although they have *a* in the first syllable,—perhaps even **ዳፍንት**

(1) Cf. on the last two examples EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ §§ 409, 411.

(2) On **ሀብት** from **hābet*, **hābat* v. KÖNIG, p. 121.

(3) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Arab.*’ § 411.

(4) Like the Hebr. **תָּבַח**, **תָּבַח** EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 137, *d*. Otherwise KÖNIG, p. 117.

(5) For it is improbable that **ነፍስት** is merely a simple Fem. of **ነፍስ** “soul”.

“cake baked under hot ashes” ($\sqrt{\text{ḤḤ}}$ “to conceal”), supposing *a* to have been lengthened into \bar{a} . Such forms are now and then turned into Abstract Nouns:—**ዝሩት** “dispersion”, Gen. 11, 9 (from **ዝርው** ‘what is scattered’), **ድቡት** (in **በድቡት**, **ድቡተ** “opportunist”), **ሕቢት** “administration” (‘that which is administered’, from **ሕቡይ**) Numb. 4, 28 & 29. To Masculines of the type given in § 108, *b* the following are to be referred:—**ጠሊት** “she-goat” (**ጠሊ**), **ነቢይት** (Judges 4, 4) and **ነቢት** “prophetess”, **እግዚእት** and **እግዝእት** “mistress” (§ 36), **ሊቅት** “abbess” (§ 36). From Participles of the type § 109, *a*—come: **ባዕልት** “mistress” (from **ባዕል**), **ሳኒት** and **ሰኒት** “the following day” (from **ሳንይ**), perhaps also **ሠዊት** “ear of corn”,—and, in a much abbreviated form, **ናእት** “that which is unleavened” (root ʿḤ); also, from an Adjectival word given in § 110, *a*:—**ተባዕት** “that which is of the male sex”. From **ቍልጌ** (§ 118, *γ*) comes **ቍልጌት** “maid-servant”.

Forms with inseparable **ት** from Stems of Multiliteral Roots are represented by—**ድንግልት** “virgin” (*f.*) (inasmuch as **ድንግል** may also mean ‘a young man, still pure’), **ጽርንዕት** “scab”, “leprosy”, **ፍርፍርት** “quails”, **ሕንብርት** “navel”, **ኩስኩስት** (= **ኩስኩስ**) “pitcher”, “can”; **ቂንዛእት** “lock (of hair)” (= **ቂንዛእ**), **ጠፍላሕት** “coin”, **ጸላዕት** “rocky ground” (*cf.* **صَلَاة**) = **ጸላዕ** Sir. 22, 1; **ጸማዕት** “hermit’s cell” (**صَوْمَعَة**); **ሰንበልት** “spikenard” (**ሰንበል**, § 36); **ድርኩሱት** “hinge of a door” (§ 26,—end), **ሌሊት** “night” (root **ለለየ**, *cf.* **لَيْلَة**); **እምሔውት** “ancestress” (from **እምሔው**, § 36).

It has already been pointed out that Feminine forms from Nominal Stems with **ተ** or **መ** prefixed (§§ 111 & 116) take the closely attached **ት** likewise. A peculiar form is met with in **መርዓት** “bride”, “daughter-in-law” (“*sponsa*”, from **መርዓ** “espousals”, § 116); *cf.* KÖNIG, p. 117.

§ 129. 2. *Adjectives and Participles*, with a few exceptions, take the consonantal ending **ት**. Certain of them have no distinct form at all for the Feminine; while a third series—and not a very numerous one—of Adjectives exhibit Feminines of inner formation.

(*a*) Thus,—to begin with the last-named class,—Adjectives, which have \bar{i} after the second radical, as described in § 108, *b*, like **ሐዲስ** “new”, have given up the outer formation. The reason for this was that the \bar{i} which thus preceded the closely attached feminine **ት** was bound to be shortened into *e* (§ 36). This formation,

2. Feminine
of
Adjectives
and
Participles:
By Inter-
polation of \bar{u}
in the Stem.

in point of fact, is still met with in the case of a few words, which are used in a more Substantive meaning:—**ልሂቅ** “a senior”, (‘a venerable person, either by age or office’) *m.*; Fem. **ልህቅት** (Plur. **ልሂቃት**); **እግዝእት** “mistress”, “lady”, from **እግዚእ** ⁽¹⁾. But as the Feminines of these Adjectives would in this way coincide with those of the type **ግብር**, another formation came into use, according to which the Feminine ending, which consists of the vowel *ā*, is interpolated in the stem itself ⁽²⁾, and either blends with the *ī* into an *ē*, or,—as is usually the case,—is directly substituted for the *ī*. These Adjectives accordingly take regularly *ā* in the Feminine instead of *ī*: **ሐዲስ**, **ሐዳስ**; **ጠቢብ**, **ጠባብ**; **ዐዚዝ**, **ዐዛዝ**; **ጸቢብ**, **ጸባብ**; **ቀድሕ** (**ቀድሕ**), **ቀያሕ**; **ዐቢይ**, **ዐባይ**. From roots *mediae gutturalis*, which have in the Masculine the form **ርሐብ** “far”, “wide”, there is formed, in accordance with § 44 *sq.*, **ረሐብ** (Matt. 7, 13), and similarly **ረኃጽ** “pampered” (Deut. 28, 56). **የማን** “right hand”, **ፀጋም** “left hand”, and also **ውፃእ** “a divorced woman” (Lev. 21, 14) ⁽³⁾ appear now only in the Feminine. The mixed sound *ē*, from *ā + i*, is exhibited by **እቤር** and **አቤር** “old woman” (from a lost masculine **አቢር** = **كبير**) ⁽⁴⁾. The Adjectives mentioned in § 110, *b* are hitherto known only in one gender, either Masc. or Fem.—On the Feminine form of some words,—turned Substantives,—which belong to this formation with *ī* and come from roots with final *ī*, like **ነቢይ**, v. § 128.

(1) As is the case invariably in Tigrīña: SCHREIBER, p. 28.—From **ነኩር** “strange”, “foreign”, there is still found **ነኩርት** *ἀλλοτρία*, alongside of **ነኩር**: So too **ደቂቅት** as a collateral form to **ደቃቅ**; v. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’ coll. 667, 1099.

(2) V. analogues in the Plural-formation.—Similarly in Tigrē, in Verbs *tertiæ gutturalis*, *ū* is interpolated before the third radical in the Imperf., Subj. and Imper.: v. NÖLDEKE, ‘*W. Zeitschr. f. d. K. d. Morg.*’ IV, p. 295 [and LITTMANN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ XIV, p. 45].—This inner formation may also be pointed out in Arabic: Cf. TRUMPF, p. 541, N. 1.—Other explanations of this form than the above are given in KÖNIG, p. 87 *sq.*, and in PRAETORIUS, ‘*Amh. Spr.*’, p. 148.—For the accentuation cf. TRUMPF *l. c.*

(3) Although the word, which would be **ውፃእ** in the Masc., is formed rather as a Pass. Part., and is therefore pronounced with an *ē* after the first radical.

(4) **ብሔር** and **መሬት** possibly belong to the same formation.

(b) All the other Adjectives and Participles have the outer formation through the ending **ት**. Outer
Formation
by the
Ending **ት**.

(α) The type given in § 108, *a*, has no longer, it is true, a feminine form, as a rule, because the words concerned are more in use as Substantives; however, see **ሕያውት** (*e. g.* Ruth 1, 19) from **ሕያው** “alive”. Multiliteral Adjectives of the type **ደገደግ**, § 112, *b*, take their Feminines from the type **ድግዳግ**.

(β) The type given in § 108, *c*, shortens its *ū* into *é*; and all words of this type without exception follow this formation⁽¹⁾: **ስኩብ**, **ስኩብት** (*sekēbt*)⁽²⁾; **ብፁዕ**, **ብፅዕት**; **ነኑን**, **ነንንት**, **ግዩር**, **ግዩርት** (*geyért*); **ምዉእ** (**ምውእ**), **ምውእት**; **ርህሩህ**, **ርህርህት**; **ሠሩር**, **ሠርርት**. In some cases it serves the purpose of expressing Abstracts, *e. g.* **ፍሥሕት** *ἰλαρότης*. Words from roots with final *i* adopt the vowel-pronunciation of the last radical, suppressing the *é*:—**እኩይ**, **እኩት** (*ekít*); **ርዉይ** (**ርውይ**), **ርዊት**⁽³⁾; **ሉጸይ**, **ሉጸት** (“shaven”, 1 Cor. 11, 5); **ጽሕዩይ**, **ጽሕዩት**; from roots ending in *ū*, either the form **ሀልውት**, *heléwwet* (from **ሀልው** *heléww*⁽⁴⁾), or, with contraction of the diphthong into *ū*: **ሀሉት** *helūt*; **ርጎው**, **ርጉት**; **ጽዕድው**, **ጽዕዱት** [**ዕድው**, **ዕዱት** *Kebra Nag.* 138 a, 16]. In words which have a *u*-containing Guttural as second-last radical, like **ርኩስ** “unclean” (from **ርኩስ**) the *u*-containing pronunciation re-appears in the Fem.: **ርኩስት**, which only by a wrong use (§ 42) again passes into **ርኩስት** (*Hen.* 5, 4)⁽⁴⁾. In words which have **ጠ**, **ደ** or **ተ** as last radical the formative **ት** blends with the final letter: **እቱት**, fem. **እትት** (*etét*); **ምውት** or **ምዉት**, fem. **ምውት**; **ሥጉት**, **ሥገት**; **ትሐት**, **ትሕት**; **ክቡድ**, **ክብድ** *kebéd* (*Deut.* 30, 11), &c. (§ 54 sq.).

(γ) The Feminines of the type § 109, *a*, are regularly formed by appending **ት** without any vowel-change in addition: **ጸድቅ**, **ጸድቅት**; **ራድእ**, **ራድእት**, **ባቀዕ**, **ባቀዕት**; **ሣልስ**, **ሣልስት**; **ላሕይ**, **ላሕይት** or **ላሒት**; but from **ዋሕድ**, in accordance with § 54, **ዋሕድ** is again given. **አብድ** “foolish” has in the Fem. the forms

(1) When LUDOLF in his Dictionary adduces not only **ንእስት** from **ንኡስ** “little” but also a Fem. **ንእስ**, the latter is of course to be referred to a Masc. form **ንኡስ** which has disappeared.

(2) For the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 541.

(3) [Along with **ርውይት** *Is.* 58, 11; v. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’, col. 307. *TR.*]

(4) [FLEMMING reads in this passage **ርኩሳት**. *TR.*]

አብድ, **አብድት** or **እብድ** (from **እብድ**). **ኀር** “good” also forms, without any vowel-change, **ኀርት**.

(d) In place of the type given in § 110, *a*, from which Feminines are not readily formed, comes the type which is described in § 117, *a*, furnished with the Adjective-ending *î*, and to which the feminine termination **ት** is easily attached. The feminine **ሠናይት**, however, occurs from **ሠናይ** and even the contracted form **ሠኔት** Judges 8, 32; and from **ሠያጥ** “trader”, we have, shortening the *ā* (§ 36), the feminine form **ሠየጥ**. The adjectives of this type, mentioned in § 112, *b*, from multiliteral roots, appear in like manner to have no feminine forms: the Feminine of **ጸዐጸ** is the same as the Masc. (Matt. 5, 36). **መከን** “unfruitful” “barren” (*f.*) would be a masculine form used as a feminine, if the middle radical were really double, as LUDOLF represents: it would in that case have to be regarded perhaps like **كامل** ⁽¹⁾; but v. PRAETORIUS, ‘*Tigrīna*’ p. 180. On the other hand **ወላድ** “fruitful” (*f.*), “having children”, may be understood in accordance with § 36 (= **ወላድት**). **ዘማ** “fornicator or whore” is both masculine and feminine.

(e) Farther, the Participles which are described in § 114 take **ት**, in so far as they form Feminines at all, and do not as Substantives remain unaltered in the Fem. or pass over to the formation given in § 118 ⁽²⁾: **መደንግዕት**, **መምህርት**, **መስተምሕርት**, **መስተፍሥሕት**, **መረብዕት**, **መጥግስት**, **መወልት** “midwife” (for **መወልድት**, § 36), and so too **መጽዕጥ** “a female perfumer”. From roots *tertiæ i* the Fem. regularly gives the vowel-sound to the last radical,—a pronunciation which may be met with even in the Masc.: **መፍሪት**, from **መፍርይ**; **መጥሲት**, from **መጥዕይ**; **መንሂት**, from **መንህይ**; **መሴሲት**, from **መሴስይ** ⁽³⁾. On the other hand, roots *tertiæ u* take their Fem. from the type given in § 118, instead of a Fem. of their own form.

(ζ) All words which end in the Adjective-termination *î*

(1) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 298, [where the rule is given: *Adjectiva quae e sensu suo non possunt nisi ad feminas spectare, sine term. manent, ut حامل* “*gravida*” &c. TR.]

(2) For the accentuation cf. TRUMPP, p. 542.

(3) [**ማሪት** is also met with in both genders, v. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’ col. 168.]

(§§ 117—119) simply attach ት in the Fem.: መሐሪ, መሐሪት; መዋቲ, መዋቲት; ጎላዪ, ጎላዪት; መምሰሊ, መምሰሊት; መጥዐዪ, መጥዐዪት; መንፈሳዊ, መንፈሳዊት. ት may also be simply attached to the Adjective-termination *āi* (§ 119 end), *e. g.* ማእከላይት “mediatory” (*f.*), Hen. 76, 6; but most of the Masculines in *āi*, instead of the Fem.-form *āit*, prefer to take their Fem. in *āwīt* or *īt*, *e. g.* አረጋዊ and አረጋይ “old”, Fem. አረጋዊት and አረጊት. Thus is it, in particular, with the numeral Adjectives in *āi*, like ዳግማይ “the second”, Fem. ዳግማዊት or ዳግማት.

A few Substantives avail themselves of an Adjective-termination, by way of analogy, for the purpose of forming Feminines: ዐንበሳ “lion”, ዐንበሳዊት “lioness”; ዲያቆን “deacon”, ዲያቆናዊት “deaconess”.

§ 130. Although Ethiopic is in possession of sufficient re- The Gender-
usage in
Ethiopic.
sources to enable it to distinguish the feminine gender from the masculine by outward indication, and although a host of independent Nouns have a formation marked by the feminine termination, the presence or the absence of that termination is by no means decisive for the actual gender of a word as employed in the language. Not only are there many expressions or names which the language has regarded as feminine from the very first, without marking them as such by their termination, *e. g.* እም “mother”, ድን ግል “maiden” &c., but difference in time and locality added its influence to render the outward mark of gender of trifling importance in settling the actual gender assigned in speech. That which was regarded as feminine at the time when its form was put into shape, might at another time be thought of, without difficulty, as masculine. When one conception passed into another,—for example, when the Abstract passed into the Concrete, it was naturally attended by a change in the view taken of the gender. The dialectic variations in the several districts, in which the speech was used, have also to be considered in this connection. Owing to the co-operation of these influences, the treatment of gender fluctuated more notably in Ethiopic than in any other Semitic tongue,—more even than in Hebrew, which most resembles Ethiopic in this particular feature. The great majority of Nouns may be used both as masculine and as feminine, whether they are furnished with feminine terminations or not. It is only a few settled principles that can be discerned for dealing with this aspect of the language; but these are not so settled

or so binding as to prevent speaker or writer from having abundant freedom in his conception of gender. Still, in those manuscripts which are accessible to us, all being of relatively late origin, an advance may be perceived, from an utter want of system to a comparatively settled system. The older manuscripts show invariably the prevalence of a freer standpoint, while the later ones strive at least to avoid, as far as possible, the capricious alteration of the conception of the gender of a word in the same sentence or section.

We cannot therefore pretend to reduce the Gender-usage in Ethiopic to any certain rules, or to give an exhaustive account of it⁽¹⁾. The task of determining the gender with exactness must be left to the dictionary, in the case of every individual word. It is only the main principles guiding the treatment of Gender in Ethiopic, which fall to be noticed in this place.

The Gender is distinguished with perfect strictness and regularity only in the case of living beings, possessing that distinction in themselves. All proper names of men, all words which indicate a man or a male agent—, like **ብእሱ**, **ሰብእ**, **ነቢይ**, **ገብር**, **ወልድ**, **መልአክ**, **መስፍን** &c.—are constantly treated as masculine; all names and appellations of women and female agents, as feminine, whether these words have any external mark of gender or not. But even in this class a few nouns are met with, having the gender common,—like **ድንግል**,—in particular those which were at first conceptional words or Abstracts, such as **መርሕ** “leader”, *m.* and *f.*, **ግዕዝ** “widow” and “widower”, **ሰማዕት** (“testimony”) “witness” *m.* and *f.*, **እንግዳ** (“state of an alien”) “foreigner”, *m.* and *f.* (Ruth 2, 10), and some which end in *ūt*, § 120, *a.* In names of animals the gender is seldom distinguished by any special termination,—in fact, scarcely ever, except in the case of those which are oftenest spoken of, like **በግዕ** and **በግዕት**, **አድግ** and **አድግት**, **ጠሊ** and **ጠሊት** (not always used); sometimes separate words are employed⁽²⁾, like **ሶር** “bull”, **እጐልት** “cow”, **ገመል** and **ናቀት**, **ውዕላ**⁽³⁾ and **ወይጠል**; but most names of animals have only one

(1) V. on this subject LUDOLF, ‘Gr.’ III, 5.

(2) [Just as in other Semitic languages; cf. BEZOLD, in H. OSTHOFF’s ‘Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen’, Heidelberg, 1900, p. 76.]

(3) [Deut. 14, 5 would, however, lead us to suppose that these two words

single form, such as **ከልብ**, **ድብ**, **ፈረስ**, **ዝእብ**, **ኅየል**, and are distinguished in gender as masculine or feminine, when that has to be done,—only by the gender being differentiated in the predicate, or in some appositional word⁽¹⁾. In the case of winged creatures, or those which have their habitation in the water, or in the case of reptiles or crawling animals, even this method of distinguishing the gender is usually given up. Some of their names have a masculine form, some a feminine (**ርግብ**, **አንቄ**, **ፈዐው**, **ፍርፍርት**, **ጽግነት**, **ላጽቄት** &c.), but they may be treated as masculine or feminine without any regard to their termination.

As to the other words, it is true that the majority of Abstracts, as well as of Nouns of action, production, kind and manner, and of true Infinitives are already marked as feminine by their form; but a minority of the forms show that these conceptions may also be entertained in the gender readiest to hand, that is to say, the masculine. And this alternative possibility is continued in the actual gender-usage. Any conceptional word which is unprovided with a feminine marking may yet be treated as feminine, and any conceptional word which has a feminine termination may be treated as masculine, or rather as being without gender, so that it coincides with the masculine, the latter having itself no outward mark of gender. Even those words which in their formation have been kept absolutely free from a feminine termination, such as Names of Places (§ 115), may be treated as feminine. A few Infinitives may suffice here as examples: **ውእቱ** : **ምህሮ** 1 Cor. 9. 14; **ተፋቅሮ** : **ፍጽምት** 1 John 4, 18; **ብዑድ** : **ፀኒሶት** : **ወወሊዶት** *Org.*; **ርትዕት** : **አሚን** “the true faith” [*lit.* ‘right believing’ *Inf.*] &c. Words like **ልደት**, **ድቀት**, **ስእለት**, **ፍትወት**, **ጽልመት** may be treated as masculine or as feminine with equal propriety (though fem. in form); and on the other hand words like **ስም**, **ኅይል**, **ሕግ** (though masc. in form) may equally well be treated as feminine. Accordingly Collective Nouns and Nouns of Quantity, as well as Collective Plural-forms (§ 135 *sqq.*) may be used both in the masculine and feminine.

In the department of true substantives and designations of

do not indicate the *male and female of one species of gazelle*, but are *names for two distinct species*. TR.]

(1) Or by other devices: *cf.* the examples in Hen. 60, 7 & 8; 85, 3. [and *Kebra Nag.* 111 b 20.]

inanimate beings and things, the names of countries, districts, cities, towns are preponderatingly feminine, although **ሀገር** “city” itself is of common gender; and expressions, even, like **ሲዳና፡ዐቢይ** Josh. 11, 8 are met with (but otherwise in Josh. 11, 2; 19, 28). But the names of the various parts of the body, as well as the names of tools, articles of clothing, dwellings and trees are of common gender⁽¹⁾. Names of rivers and mountains, of roads, wells, stars (yet **ፀሐይ** may also be feminine), of the powers of the heavens (rain, wind, dew, hail &c.), of metals and weapons—are chiefly masculine. **መንፈስ** “spirit”, “intelligence” is of common gender; but when used of the Holy Spirit, it is always masculine. **ነፍስ** “soul” is usually feminine; **ነፍስት** and **ሥጋ** “body” usually masculine. Victuals also have mostly names in the masc. gender,—even **ጎበስት** “bread”.

2. NUMBERS OF NOMINAL STEMS.

Numbers of
Nominal
Stems:—
Faint Traces
of a Dual.

§ 131. Ethiopic, like Syriac, has completely given up the Dual Number. Without doubt it once possessed it, just like the other Semitic tongues; and a trace of it is preserved in the word **ክልኢ** “two”, inasmuch as the final *ē* in that numeral can only be explained as a curtailed and blunted dual-ending (**ጠፍላፍ**)⁽²⁾. Similarly in the *Eth. Bilinguis* l. 3 the Dual **ሃየወሃክ** **أَخَوَيْه** is still met with, according to D. H. MÜLLER, ‘*Epigr. Denkm.*’ p. 68. Lastly, the remains of a Dual may be recognised,—according to PRAETORIUS, ZDMG XXXIV, p. 222 & XLVII, p. 395,—in the form **እዴ** “hand”, which appears before suffixes, and in **ሐቋ** “loins”⁽³⁾. When the notion of “both” has to be more definitely expressed, the numeral “two” must be called in to assist. After losing the Dual, Ethiopic preserved only the distinction between that which was a single individual and that which consisted of several individuals or formed a mass. This distinction, however, has produced, in other Semitic languages, and particularly in Arabic, four Clas-

⁽¹⁾ **ከርሥ** “body” is generally feminine.

⁽²⁾ I venture to make the like conjecture regarding the word **ደደ** “door”, Plural **ደዳት**, Deut. 3, 5; 6, 9 (as if coming from **ደድ**), and **ደደያት**. I hold **ደደ** to be a contraction for **ገፍገፍ**.

⁽³⁾ Cf. also TRUMPP ZDMG XXXIV, p. 236. But v. BARTH ‘*Deutsche Ltrzg.*’ 1887, Sp. 1303: ‘*Nominalbildung*’ p. 6.

ses of Numbers. When, for instance, the ground-form merely expresses the notion of one individual, like “man”, a new form is developed from it which expresses plurality, mass, or collectivity, and there emerges the contrast between *Singular* and *Plural*. But when the ground-form gives expression to a generic or collective notion, like “hair”, a form is developed to denote an individual specimen from the mass, and thus we have the contrast between the collective word, and the word designating one of the Class (*Generalis* and *Nomen Unitatis*).

1. *The latter contrast*, as conditioning a special mode of formation, is but feebly carried out in Ethiopic. In by far the largest number of names given to collective notions, in which any individual can be specially singled out, the *Generalis* and the *Nomen Unitatis* coincide, although such Names *originally* denoted either the one or the other, but not both. Thus ሰብአ stands for both “man” (*coll.*) and “a man”; ሐራ “an army” and (along with ሐራዊ) “a warrior”; እንስሳ “beasts” and “a beast”; ያፍ “fowl” and “a bird”; ንፍብ “swarm of bees” and “a bee”; ያም “a wood” and “a tree”; ዕፂ “vermin” and “a worm” &c. Many Collectives, serving in this way also as Nouns denoting individuals, come to take the Plural even,—a proceeding not strictly admissible with merely Collective Nouns. Besides, Ethiopic seems at one time to have had the power of deriving Nouns, denoting single specimens, from Collective Nouns, by means of a special form,—namely the feminine-ending. That, at least, is the only explanation of the remarkable circumstance that several names of plants and animals have feminine terminations⁽¹⁾. The ending in question is generally *ā*⁽²⁾: ውዕላ πύαργος (Deut. 14, 5), ቶራ βούβαλος (*ibid.*), ተዙላ “male hyaena”, ብዕዛ ‘a horned animal’, ዐንበላ “lion”, አንጺዋ “mouse”, ጉዛ “falcon”, “hawk”, አንበጣ “locust”, “grasshopper” (also collective); perhaps also ጣዕዋ “suckling”, and ዳቤላ “the (male) young

1. Contrast between Class-Word and Word denoting an Individual of the Class (*Generalis* and *Nomen Unitatis*).

⁽¹⁾ The case is very similar in Hebrew, cf. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 176, a. It is remarkable also that “one” = “a single one” is usually expressed in Ethiopic by the fem. አሐቲ, and that not only when it stands by itself, as in አሐተ : ሰአሐኩ Ps. 26, 7, but also, when it qualifies a Common Noun or Conceptional word, as in አሐቲ : ቃል one word” (e. g. Josh. 21, 43; 23, 14), although ቃል as a rule, is masc.

⁽²⁾ As in the Agau dialects; cf. REINISCH, ‘*Bilinspr.*’, p. 89; ‘*Chamirspr.*’ I, p. 101; ‘*Quaraspr.*’ I, p. 89.

of an animal”, **ሰግላ** “fig-tree”, **ዘግባ** “cypress”. Though some of these words take their plural from the same form, like **ቶፊት**, **ተዙላት**, yet others of them start from the ground-form in the formation of their plural:—**ዐናብስት**, **አናብጥ**, **አናጸት**. In certain other words this *ā* seems to be changed for *ē*, see examples in § 127, c. It may be that these feminine forms are due to the poetic view of the individual as being the weaker, and the class or kind as being the stronger notion; but the individual, in accordance with another and more sensible conception of the relation, is sometimes indicated by the relative Adjectival-ending *ī* as being *that which belongs to the class*, as, e. g. in **ዐንበሪ** “a sea-monster”, from and along with **ዐንበር** (§ 118, γ). Yet this form is of even less frequent occurrence than the other. The derivation, by means of a special form, of a word denoting an individual, from its class-conception, cannot be followed up in Ethiopic beyond these traces. Ethiopic is more disposed to confuse the Class-word and the Individual-word. Thus words denoting Class-conceptions, which represent a secondary formation derived from individualising-words, are, immediately after their production, again treated as words signifying one of a class, e. g. those which are mentioned in § 120, a: **ኅላፊት** (from **ኅላፈ** “passing by”) “what passes by”, i. e. “people passing by”, Mark 15, 29, but on the other hand **አሐዱ፡ ኅላፊት** “an individual passing by”, Mark 15, 21; in the same way **ነጋዲት**, Judges 19, 17; the originally collective word **እንግዳ** “strangers” (§ 137, 5) is regularly used in turn for a single “stranger” (= **ነግድ**).

2. Contrast
between
Singular
and Plural
(One and
More than
One).

2. *The Contrast between the Singular and the Plural*, on the other hand, is quite regularly and commonly maintained. It is true that a good many words express plurality even in the Singular number, and may therefore be connected with a predicate in the Plural,—not merely all those words which are Collectives by their origin, such as names of nations, countries and communities, but even names of single beings like **ብእሷ** “man” or “men”, **ዐር** “enemy” or “enemies”. But when it is called for in the interests of clearness, the most of these can either form their own plural, or make up for it by the plural of another word, like **ዕደው** for **ብእሷ**. Actual Singular-Nouns, which are incapable of forming a Plural, like **ዘይት** “an olive-tree” (Plur. used being **ዕፀወ፡ ዘይት**), are of rare occurrence; and even regular Class-words or Collective Nouns may take the plural, seeing that they frequently

represent the Individual-, as well as the Class-notion (v. *supra*). On the other hand a large number of other Singular-notions, particularly words indicating bulk, are by their very nature incapable of taking the plur.:—such as, **ወርቅ** “gold”, **ሐመዳ** “snow”, **መዓር** “honey”, **እክል** “food”, **ፀምር** “wool”, **ጢስ** “smoke”, **ጽላሎት** “shadow”. And true Abstracts are just as little capable of the plur., such as **ውዕዩት** “burning”, **ተፋጸሜት** “completion”, **ፍቅር** “love”, **ጽምእ** “thirst”, and in particular all Infinitives. But even such words, in the case of some definite development of the conception, become again capable of taking the Plur.; e. g. **ምድር** means “earth”, but also “land”; accordingly it takes, in the latter sense, the Plur. **አምዳር**. In the same way from **ብሩር** “silver” and **ብርት** “brass” appear the Plurals **ብሩራት** “silver pieces” and **ብርታት** “articles of brass”; and from **ጠል** “dew” comes the Plur. **ጠላት** “fat”. **ጥበብ** “wisdom” takes a Plur. with the meaning “arts”, and **ምሕረት** “compassion” does the like, in the sense of “displays of compassion”. And, in this way, even Infinitive-forms admit sometimes of the Plural, as **ወሓይዝት** “rivers”, from **ውሒዝ** “to flow”, “flowing” = “river”; and **አስተብቀዓታት** “suppliant entreaties”.

But the language on the other hand possesses words which are used either in the Plur. alone, or in the Plur. specially⁽¹⁾. The signification of the Plural, which indicates a definite or indefinite number of individuals, carries with it as such the possibility of conceiving that sum of individuals as a united and single notion (v. *infra* § 141), like “tents” = “encampment”. This explains how Ethiopic expresses certain ideas in the Plural form, which other languages denote by words in the Singular. Add to this,—that in Semitic tongues the Plural expresses not merely a number of individuals which may be counted, but also the mass, the collectivity, and whatever is the highest and most general form of the contents of the notion. Thus existences and objects, which produce the impression of mass and boundless sublimity, or in which the apex and essence of every individual within a given conception is viewed or thought of, are put in the Plural in Ethiopic, while other languages employ a mere Singular instead. *Pluralia tantum*

Special Uses
of certain
Plurals.

(1) Apart from words, whose Singular cannot, as it happens, be supported from any writings as yet known to us.

are, it is true, very seldom met with. The language is too well worn and too thoroughly developed, not to have a Singular formed and in use as time went on, in the case of the greater number of words, even though they might have been allowed only in the Plural at a more antique stage. But there is a series of words which are used in the Plural as single notions and with the same force as a Singular. The name of "God", **አምላክ** designates him as the *highest of the Lords*, the essence of all lordship, just as the poetical name **አርያም** designates "heaven" as *the highest height*. Farther, names of spaces, which have a perimeter and enclose what is individual, or of things which embrace an abundance of what is individual, or which consist of several remarkable portions, —are frequently used in the Plural, *e. g.* **አርማስ** "raft", **ራግናት** "boat", **ራግዛት** "doorposts", **አስራብ** "waterfall", **አማዑስ** "bowels", **ጸራዒት** "the loins", **ሕፀን** (*pl.*) = **ሕፅን** (*sg.*) (Ex. 4, 6 *sqq.*) "the bosom", **ጉፃጉሪ** "a rough road" ('a continuation of rough places'), **መቃብር** "burying-place" and "grave", **መፃምርት** "marriage", "spouse", **በይናት** "between" (literally, 'spaces lying between'), **ዕደዋት** "cross-road" (Mark 11, 4), **ጸቃውዕ** "honey dropped from the comb". In the intellectual region:—**ጠባይዕ** "the natural disposition" (as the essence of many several faculties [*lit.* 'impressions']), **አምሳል** "image" (inasmuch as it consists of many bits of likeness), **ተአምር** "a miracle" (because of its many startling phenomena), **አምጣን** "measure, size, sum, duration" (because enclosing within it a mass of individual space-, and time-parts). The same way of looking at things has produced in turn new Plurals out of these Plurals, v. § 141.

The Formation of the Plural is either brought about by terminations, which are attached to the Singular Stem, or this outer formation is replaced by an inner formation, exactly as in Arabic.

(a) *Outer Formation of the Plural.*

Masculine
Plural
Ending in
ân; Fem.
in *ât*.

§ 132. Ethiopic words form their plural either by means of the Masculine termination *ân*, or the Feminine termination *ât*, both carrying the accent (TRUMPP, p. 542)⁽¹⁾. The former,

(1) The Plural-ending *ân* is found also in Assyrian [(v. DELITZSCH,

which is paralleled by وَنَ, نَ, نَ in other tongues, seems to have arisen, in accordance with § 18, out of *ōn*, which at one time might take the place of *ān*. Both terminations have been produced by lengthening the terminations of the Singular, *ē* (in Arabic *un*) in the Masculine, and *at* in the Feminine. The termination *ān* is always attached to the final radical of the Stem of the Singular, thus taking the place of its original vowel-ending. The termination *āt*, in the case of a good many words, takes the place of the Feminine-ending *at* of the Singular, but in the majority of cases it is applied externally to the Stem of the Singular, whether that ends in *at* or in some other fashion. It is by no means the case, however, that every word which wants the Fem. termination in the Sing. takes *ān* in the Plur., or that every Fem. Stem has *āt* in the Plur.; for while the form without the Fem. termination is the one which comes most readily to hand in the Singular, and the Fem. termination appears only on special grounds, the reverse is the case in the formation of the Plural. Every Plural, as expressing a number or an assemblage of individuals, is a Collective word, and, in a certain sense, an Abstract. But Abstracts, even in the Singular number, are predominantly conceived of as Fem.; and accordingly it is the Feminine termination which prevails most in the Plural Number, and it is the Masculine which only makes its appearance on special grounds.

1. Words signifying Persons, and Descriptive words, *i. e.* 1. Personal Adjectives and Participles, are the only ones which take the Masculine termination *ān* in the Plural. But not every word which signifies a Person takes its Plural in *ān*: several have *āt* (§ 133, *a*), and many replace the outer formation by the inner, which is the mode followed even by some Descriptive words. When a Descriptive word admits of the Masculine termination *ān*, it takes at the same time the termination *āt* for the Feminine. Besides, one set form the Fem. Plur. from the Masc. Plur.⁽¹⁾, another form it from the Fem. Sing. Coming to details we must attend to the following:—

1. Personal
and
Descriptive
Words tak-
ing Outer
Plural
Ending *ān*.
Detailed
Rules and
Exceptions
(*a-g*).

(*a*) Words of the type given in § 108, *a*, occur but seldom in the Plural, and have an outer formation: ኣዳው, ኣዳዋን; ዕረቃን,

‘*Assyr. Gramm.*’, § 67)]. In Tigre *ām* is the corresponding termination; cf. NÖLDEKE, ‘*W. Ztschr. f. d. K. d. M.*’ IV, p. 299.

(¹) [But v. Note to (*b*), *infra*. TR.]

ዕረቃት (**ጥራያን** Hen. 14, 6)⁽¹⁾; in the same way **ሕዳጣን** “few” (pl.), and **ደገደግ** (§ 112, b), **ደገደጋን**.

(b) Words of the type given in § 108, b, so far as they are pure Adjectives, have usually the Outer formation: **ሐዲስ** “new”, **ሐዲሳን**, Fem.—from the Sing. **ሐዲስ** (§ 129, a)—**ሐዲሳት**; in the same way **ጠቢብ**, **ጠቢባን**, **ጠባባት**. Often, however, they form their Fem. Plur. from the Masc. Plur.⁽²⁾, so that instead of **ዐባያት** the form **ዐባያት** is more frequently found; in the same way **ጠቢባት**; **በሊቃት** “sharp” (pl.) (Hen. 10, 5); **ደቂቃት** and **ደቃቃት**. Some form an Inner Plur. as well as an Outer: **ቀጢን**, **ቀጢናን** and **ቀጢንት**; **ዐቢይ**, **ዐቢይት**; **ጠቢብ**, **ጠቢብት** (§ 138): and so too **ኄር** “good”, **ኄራን**. Of words of this type which are used rather as Substantives, **መሲሕ** “Messiah” regularly takes the form **መሲሐን**; **ልሂቅ** (**ሊቅ**) “the Primus” and “old” has **ልሂቃን**, Fem. **ልሂቃት**, or **ሊቃን**, **ሊቃት**; **ቀሲስ** “Presbyter” has the Outer formation **ቀሲሳን** as well as an Inner form. The remainder have other forms, so far as they have any Plural at all.

(c) Participles of the type given in § 108, c (111, b; 112, b) take, throughout, the Outer formation, and derive their Fem. Plur. not from the Fem. Sing., but from the Masc. Plur.⁽³⁾: **ክሠት** “manifest”, **ክሠታን**, **ክሠታት**; **ርጎው** “open”, **ርጎዋን**, **ርጎዋት** (*rehewwät*). Participles from roots middle *ū* frequently assume (in accordance with § 52) the contracted form in the Plur.: **ምውት** “dead”, **ሙታን**, **ሙታት**; but also **ምውቅ** “warm”, **ምውቃን** and **ምውቃት**, or from a Singular **ምውቅ**: **ምውቃን**, **ምውቃት**. It is but very rarely that these Participles have the inner formation, as in **ቅድው** “pure”, “genuine”, Plur. **ቀድውት**; as also in the word which is always used substantively **ንጉሥ** “king”, Plur. **ነገሥት**; on the other hand **ዕድው** “enemy”, **ዕድዋን**. Of Feminines of this type (§ 128) which have come to be used substantively, **ዕቅብት** “concubine” conforms to the Participles

(1) [FLEMMING adopts here the variant **ጥርያኒሆሙ**. TR.]

(2) [Would it not be better to say *Sing.*? Just as one form of the Feminine Plural, viz. **ዐባያት**, comes from the Feminine Singular **ዐባይ**, by adding *āt*, so the other form **ዐባያት** may be regarded as coming from the Masculine Singular **ዐባይ**, by adding the same termination, and in the same way; cf. PRAETORIUS, ‘*Aethiop. Gramm.*’ p. 105. TR.]

(3) [V. last Note. TR.]

and takes the Plur. **ዕቁባት** as well as **ዕቅብታት**. (On the other hand, **ንግሥት** “queen”, **ሐብርት** “coloured decoration”, and others, form the plural quite externally: **ንግሥታት**, **ሐብርታት**).

(d) Participles of the type in § 109, *a*, and the like, take mostly the outer formation, when they are used as Adjectives—: **ካልእ**, **ካልኣን**, **ካልኣት**; **ኃጥኣን**, **ኣብዳን**, **ዐርካን**; **ዐርክ** “friend” has an inner formation also; **ረድኦ**, **ባዕል** (**መርሕ**, **ላህም**) have only an inner formation. On **ካህን** v. § 133, *a*.

(e) Words of the type in § 110, *a* have still an outer formation, when used as Adjectives:—**ሠናይ**, **ሠናያን**, **ሠናያት**, but an inner, when they indicate an Agent, whether they are formed in the sing. with or without the termination *ī*. Multiliteral:—**ሐንካስ**, **ሐንካሳን**, but **ጸዐዳ** and **ጸዕዳ** with an inner formation.

(f) Participles and *Nomina Agentis*, formed with the prefix **መ** (§ 114) take, in the Plur., *ān* for the Masc. termination, and *āt* for the Fem., *e. g.* **መምህራን**, **መምህራት**⁽¹⁾. Some form an Inner Plural, *e. g.* **መምክር** “counsellor”, **መማክርት**; in the same way **መቅርን**, **መኰንን**, **መፅርር** and others. **ማሪ** “seer” (of common gender) has either **ማርያን**, or **ማርያት** (§ 133, *a*), or **ማረይት** (§ 138).

(g) All Adjectives with outer Adjective-terminations take regularly the outer formation (§§ 117—119), while the *ī* is hardened into a semivowel before the terminations⁽²⁾:—**ተዐጋሢ**, **ተዐጋሥያን**, **ተዐጋሥያት**; **መፍቀሪ**, **መፍቀርያን**, **መፍቀርያት**; **ኣረሚ**, **ኣረምያን**; **መንፈሳዊ**, **መንፈሳውያን** and **መንፈሳውያት**; so **ክርስቲያን** “Christians”, from a Singular not in use. Some words ending in *ī*, of the class described in § 118, *γ*, and some, ending in *āi* (v. § 119), form their Plur. from the termination *āwī*:—**ዐረቢ**, “an Arab”, Plur. **ዐረባውያን**. The words **ኣረጋዊ** “an old man”, **ኖላዊ** “shepherd”, and **ኖትያዊ** *ναύτης* have an inner or feminine formation: **ኣእሩግ** (from a lost Sing. **ኣርግ**), **ኖሎት** (for **ኖለውት**), **ኖትያት** (§ 133). **ፈያታዊ** “robber” and **ኣይሁዳዊ** “a Jew” are words, denoting an individual, which have been derived from

(1) If, as LUDOLF says, **መድልው** has **መደልዋን** in the Plur. (Ps. 52, 7), as well as **መድልዋን** (Matt. 6, 2), a Singular **መደልው** is the basis of it, and there is no need to explain **መደልዋን** by any application of EWALD's rule, as given in ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 300.

(2) [V., however, *Kebrā Nag.*—Introd., p. XVI.]

Plurals (§ 131), and which form their plur., simply by returning to their respective ground-forms **ፈያት** and **አይሁድ**. The most of the substantives enumerated in § 118, γ, have an inner formation. Farther, the words which are dealt with in § 117, α, of the type **ገባሬ**,—some of which are interchangeable with those of the type **ገባር** (§ 110, α), usually take the inner formation. It is only a small number of words of this type, and these mostly used as Adjectives, that have outer terminations, *e. g.* **ለባዊ**, **ለባውያን**, **ለባውያት**. Others admit of both formations, *e. g.* **ሐረሱ**, **ገባሬ**, and in the same fashion **ጸሐፊ**, **ጸሐፍት** and **ጸሐፍያን** (G. Ad. 164, 4, 20; 166, 29); while some, like **ቀዳሚ** “the first”, have only the inner formation (*cf.* § 138). Yet even these words may take another special Feminine form with an outer termination, as well as the inner formation which may be used for both Masc. and Fem.: **ቀዳምያት**; **ሐላዩ** “singer”, Plur. Masc. **ሐለዩት** “singers” (*m.*), Plur. Fem. **ሐላዩያት** “singers” (*f.*).

Other words, besides those enumerated here, take the Masc. Plural-ending *ān*, but only on rare occasions and in the language of poetry, *e. g.* **ስርናያን : መንፈስ** “spiritual grains of wheat” (**ስርናይ**, originally an Adjective); or **ማኅበር** “association”, “congregation”: **ማኅበራን** “associates”, “colleagues”. Farther *cf.* § 141, 5.

2. Substan-
tives taking
Outer Plural
Ending
āt:—
Certain
Masc. Per-
sonal
Names.

§ 133. 2. The *Feminine termination āt* is taken by all other Substantives,—except the Personal and Descriptive Words mentioned in § 132,—which admit of an outer formation of the Plur. at all, whether they have a Fem. form in the Singular or not. The mode of attachment of this termination is generally very simple: It is of more importance to point out the cases in which this Outer Plural formation generally takes place, and this will be attempted in the following survey.

(a) *Masculine Names of Persons* have as a rule, it is true, in accordance with § 132 the masculine termination *ān*, but yet there are several cases in which they must take the fem. termination in the Plural. In particular, (1) *All Proper Names*, masculine and feminine, have the outer formation in the Plur., and in fact the termination *āt*: **መቃሪስ** “Macarius”, **መቃሪሳት**; **ማርያም** “Mary”, **ማርያማት**. (2) *Masculine words indicating Persons*, and which denote an office, business, or position, take the Fem. termination in the Plur., and are to be conceived of as Abstracts of the office or dignity:—a plurality of priests, for example, is always

“priesthood” to the Ethiopian⁽¹⁾. Accordingly we have **ከህን, ከህናት** “priests”; **ዲያቆን, ዲያቆናት**; and so is it with **ጳጳስ, ኤጲስቆጶስ, መነኮስ** “monk”, **ቆሞስ** “comes”. Hence also **ፈላስፋት** “philosophers”, **ረቦናት** “rabbis” (e. g. Matt. 16, 21 sq.), **ተንበላት** “Khalifs”, **ፈርዖናት** “Pharaohs” (*John Madabb.* ed. ZOTENBERG, p. 173). Farther, we have **ነቢይ** “prophet”, **ነቢያት**; **ሰማዕታት** “martyrs”; **ሠገራት** “guards”, “constables”; **መስተራትዓት** “lictors” (Matt. 27, 27); **ሰይጣን** “Satan”, **ሰይጣናት** (as well as the inner formation); **ማሪ** “seer”, **ማርያት** (as well as **ማርያን** and **ማረይት**); **ኬንያ** “artificer”, **ኬንያት** (together with the inner form); **ገባራት** “workmen”; **ሐዋርያ** “apostle”, **ሐዋርያት**; **ናትያዊ** “shipmaster”, **ናትያት** (from **ናትያ**); perhaps also **ፈያት** “robbers” (if this does not stand for **ፈያኦት** from **ፈያኦ**)⁽²⁾. This termination may be applied even to the Plur. **ሊቃን** “presbyters”, to turn the word into the name of the office: **ሊቃናት** (alongside of **ሊቃውንት** § 140). Sometimes also this ending is attached to words which merely express a property, e. g. **ዕራቃቲን** “naked we” from **ዕራቅ** 2 Cor. 5, 3 (cf. Hen. 32, 6 Note); cf. also **አአበዊነ፡ ኅላይያተ፡ ቤተ፡ ክርስቲያን** “O ye fathers of ours, who are solicitous for the Church” (MS. Berol., *M. Berh.* fol. 12 b).

(b) A whole series of substantives, which have a Fem. form in the Sing., take the termination *āt* in the Plural:—

(α) Singular-Stems which end in *t*, with the exception of the type **መግበርት** and **መግብርት**⁽³⁾, form the Plural in *āt*, in which the formation itself proceeds in a different way. The greater number apply the *āt* externally to the *t* of the Sing., like **ዓመት** “year”, **ዓመታት**⁽⁴⁾; only a minority form the Plur. directly from the Masc. Stem and so put *āt* in the place of the Fem.-ending of

Singular
Fem. Forms
taking *āt*
in Plural.

(1) Cf. the like in Hebr., EWALD § 177, f.; in Syr., HOFFMANN p. 253; and in Arab., EWALD § 301. In Arab. the fem.-ending for official names is comparatively common in the Sing. (EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 284, 4); in Ethiopic only a few forms of this kind occur in the Sing., with the ending *yā* (ዃ):

ኬንያ “artificer”, **ጉሕልያ** “cheat” (by profession), **ሐዋርያ** “ambassador”, “apostle”. But this termination *yā* has at other times the force of a plural, v. *infra*, § 140, IV. (2) [But v. § 132, g. TR.]

(3) The following also are exceptions: **መርዓት**, **ዙናት**, **ሥዕርት**, **ሰኩት**, **እስኪት**, **አመት**, **ወለት**, **ኅብስት**, **ኅጢአት**, and others.

(4) Cf. HAUPT, ‘*Sum. Fam.*’ p. 73.

the Singular. Thus is it with most words of the type **አረፍት** “wall” (§ 128 *ad init.*), **አረፋት**; **ዐዘቅት** “well”, **ዐዘቃት** (together with **ዐዘቅታት**); farther, **ጸበርት**, **በቀልት**; **እጐልት** “cow” has **እጐላት** and **እጐላት**; **ጸሀርት** (**ጽሀርት**) “cauldron”, **ጸሀራት**, **ጽሀራት**, **ጸሀራት** (and **ጸሀርታት**); **ክረምት** “Winter” (from a Masc. ***ክራም**), **ክራማት** (or, with the inner formation **አክራም**); **ደሴት** “island”, **ደሴያት**;—**ተመርት** “palm-tree”, on the other hand, forms **ተመርታት**. The word **ቀኖት** “nail” may, besides **ቀኖታት**, take also the form **ቅንዋት** (for **ቀንዋት**); **ኩሊት** “kidney” has **ኩሊያት** and **ኩልያት**; and **ዕሴት** “remuneration” has,—not **ዕሴያት**,—but **ዕሴያት** (Hen. 105, 1), retaining the *ē* and using only a semi-hardening (§ 40). For the rest, there are only a few additional Feminines which retain this more original form of the Plural: **ሕልቀት** “ring” takes the form **ሕልቀታት** as well as **ሕለቃት** (Ex. 30, 4, from the original Masc. form ***ሕለቅ**). The much abbreviated word **እናት** “sister” forms the Plur. **አቃት**. There are still a few more words which belong to this class, but the examples of them hitherto found occur only in the Plural: **ቅትራት** “goads”, “spurs”; **ወረዋት** “javelins”; **ራግናት** “raft”, “cordage of a ship”; **ራግዛት** “door-posts”; **ራኩባት** “female camels”.

The others apply *āt* externally to the **ት** of the Singular. But the assumption of a plural-form is mainly confined to concrete Common Nouns, like **ልገት** “hut”, **ዕለት** “day”, **ዕፀት** “shrub”, **ምኔት** “hermitage” &c. Pure conceptional words appear in the Plur. much more rarely, as **ዝብጠታት** “strokes” (Hen. 69, 6), **ጥምዐታት** (Hen. 8, 1), **በረከታት** (Hen. 71, 12), **ሐረታት** (Cant. 7, 2), **ሙተታት** (G. Ad. 124, 7), **ኒሩታት** “benefits”, **ሚጠታት** “turnings” &c.—Some words belonging to this class, *e. g.* **ኖላት** “door” and **ክልስስት** “sheaf”, take both the inner and the outer formations.

(β) On the Fem. Singular-Stems which have a vowel-ending *v. infra*, § 134.

§ 134. (c) Lastly, many Masculine Singular-Stems take this form of the Plural:—

(α) It is most largely adopted, — without exception seemingly⁽¹⁾—by all those words which have long *ā* before the final radical, plainly because the presence of this *ā* already in the Singular-stem is unfavourable to an inner formation involving the

(1) **ከሳድ** “neck” takes both the outer and the inner formation.

interpolation of another \bar{a} . Accordingly we find: (1) **ቃል**, **ቃላት**; **ማይ**, **ማያት**; (2) **ሕፃን**, “child”, **ሕፃናት**; and in like manner **ትራፍ**, **ዕጣን**, **ዝናም**, **እንል**, **ንዋይ**, **ግናይ** (**ግነያት**), **ሕዋስ**, **ፍያል**, **ትንታግ**, **ሕንባል**, **ሕንባብ** and many others; (3) **በዓል** “feast”, **በዓላት**; **ፈቃድ**, **ነፋስ**, **ሰማይ**, **ቀላይ** (**ቀላያት** and **ቀለያት**), **ሰይጣን** and others; (4) **ሥልጣን** “dominion”, **ሥልጣናት**; **ብርሃን**, **ቀስታም**, **ቆባር**, **ዲናር**, **ሮማን**, **ነጐድጓድ** and others; (5) **ትእዛዝ** “command”, **ትእዛዛት**; **ተስናን**, **ተድባብ**; (6) almost all Names of places, of the type **ምሕራም** “temple”, **ምሕራማት**; **ምሥዋዕ**, **መካን**, **ሙላድ**, **ሙፃእ** &c.; also **ምግባር** “way of acting”, “mode of action”, and similar forms. A number of other Stems, which have a long vowel before the final radical, also take this external Plural-form: **ሐሪር** “silk”, **ሐሪራት** “silk dresses”; **ብሩር**, **ብሩራት**; **ብሔር** “land”, **ብሔራት** (as well as the inner formation); **እቤር** “old woman”, **እቤራት** and **አቤራት**; **እቶን**, **ገንዶር**, **አክሊል**, **ኢዮቤል**, **ሆይ** and others.

(β) *The greater number of Nominal Stems which end in long vowels form the Plur. in āt*, whether these vowels represent Feminine-endings, or have some other origin.

In the case of *those which end in ā*, the termination $\bar{a}t$ blends with that \bar{a} , e. g. **ዓሣ** “fish”, **ዓሣት**; **ሰረገላ** “waggon”, **ደመና** “cloud”, **እንግድኦ** “breast”, **ምጉንጸ** “quiver”, (**ዕንዚራ**, **ባዝግና**, **ከተማ**, **ኩሐ**, **ቶራ**, **ተኩላ**, **ዜና**, **ኖጸ** G. Ad. 5, 1, and others):—Also **ሥጋ** “body”, **ሥጋት**; **ዘማ** “whore”, **ዘማት**; **ጸጋ** $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, **ጽላ** “*tabula*”. Even Abstracts in **ና**:—**ኅሊና** “faculty of thinking” and **ጼና** “smell” form the plurals **ኅሊናት**⁽¹⁾ and **ጼናት** (G. Ad. 4, 12).

Stems ending in \bar{e} form the plural by changing it into $y\bar{a}t$, (lengthened from yat), when that \bar{e} is the Abstract-ending spoken of in § 120 (sprung from *ia* or *iat*):—**ምሳሌ** “similitude”, “parable”, **ምሳልያት**; **ምንዳቤ**, **ምንዳብያት**; **ሥጋዌ**, **ሥጋውያት**; **ስባሔ**, **ስባሕያት**; **ውዳሴ**, **ውዳስያት**; **ውሳጤ** “the interior”, **ውሳጥያት**. On the other hand \bar{e} undergoes semi-hardening (§ 40) before $\bar{a}t$, if it has come from *a* and a Radical \bar{e} , or is of obscure origin: **ዕፄ** “vermin”, **ዕፄያት** and **ዕፀያት**; in like manner **ጽጌ** “flower”, **ግሔ** “rabbit”, **ፍሬ** “fruit”, **ፍሬያት**, **ፍረያት** and **ፍርያት** (the last not good); **ነጌ** “elephant” has **ነጌያት** (Hen. 86, 4). Farther, **ጊዜ** “time” has **ጊዜ**

(1) If this is not rather to be explained in accordance with § 122, β. **ሰቀላ**, **ሰኩና**, **ዐንበሳ**, **ተኬሳ**, **አንጼዋ**, **ወልታ**, **ዘብዳ**, **ደብተራ**, **ጽንጽያ**, **ጸታ** have the Inner Plur.-formation.

ያት; and **ደደ** “door” **ደደያት** (*cf. supra*, p. 286 § 131, Note 2); **ጊጫ** “fog”, **ጊጫያት**; **ደፄ** “sickness”; **ደፄያት**; **ግምዒ** “pitcher”, which generally has the inner formation, may take the Plural **ግምዒያት** and (from **ግምዕ**) **ግምዒት** (Numb. 4, 9 Note)⁽¹⁾.

Words ending in *ō* which take this Plural are rare. The only such Plurals yet known are **ገበዋት** from **ገበ** “side” (of the body); **ቀፈዋት** from **ቀፎ** “basket”; **ረበዋት** “myriads” (*Sing.* ፲፯); and **ግልፈዋት**, **ግልፍዋት** [but also **ግልፎዋት**, *Kebra Nag.* p. XXXII a], admittedly from a form (§ 121, β) **ግልፎ** “carved work”, —in all of which *ō* is resolved into *aw* before *āt*⁽²⁾.

On those words ending in *ī* which do not belong to this section, see § 132.

(γ) A few stray Nominal Stems, of comparatively simple form and ending in a consonant, take the outer formation *āt* in the Plural. The following are the most important and most frequently occurring of these—: **እም** “mother”, **እማት**; **ገጽ** “face”, **ጠል** “dew”, **ዝቅ** “skin-bottle”, **ድብ** “bear”, **ድድ** “foundation”, **ነፍስ** “soul”, **ኅይል** “power”, **ሰርጉ** “ornament” **ሰርጓት**, **ማእድ** “table”, **ሣህል** “grace” “favour”, **ጉድብ** “axe”, **ኅብር** “incantation” [*Hen.* 65, 6], **ነፍቅ** “box”, **ጽድቅ** “alms”, **ዝጎር** “tomb”, **ድልቅልቅ** “an earthquake”: Also **ጥበብ** “wisdom”, Plur. **ጥበባት** “arts”; farther, **ሀየል** “stag”, **ሐርገጽ** “crocodile”, **ሰገል** “divination”, **አየር** “air”, **ዘመን** “time”, **ዐንገቡጉ** “water-lizard”, **ዓለም** “world”, **ባሕርይ** “pearl”; **ፊደል** “letter of the alphabet”⁽³⁾. Others admit of the outer formation in *āt*, along with the inner:—**ቀኅል** “wound”, **ግብር** “thing”, **ሠቅ** “sack”, **ሰምር** “productiveness”, **በቀል** “plant”, **ገመል** “camel”, **ከልብ** “dog”; and with differing meanings **ነገር**, **ነገራት** “affairs”, “things”, **አንጋር** “languages”. The Plural-formation in all these stems proceeds without any change of vowels; but **ከልብ** forms **ከለባት**⁽⁴⁾.

(1) The inner formation is taken by—**ሰርፄ**, **ኦርፄ**, **ሐርጌ** and **ጉርዒ**.

(2) **ዐውሎ** “storm” takes the form **ዐውሎታት**.—**መሰንቆ** and **ዶርሆ** take the inner formation.

(3) **ጉባላት**, Gen. 30, 38, and **ዕደዋት** Mark 11, 4 can as yet be supported only in the Plur.

(4) To be explained in accordance with EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 300. Other views of the point are represented by ZIMMERN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Ass.*’ V, p. 385 and PHILIPPI, ‘*Beitr. z. Ass.*’ II, p. 377, [and especially NÖLDEKE, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*’ XVIII, p. 70].

(d) *Nominal Stems which have the formative prefix መ*, § 116, usually take the inner Plural-formation, either with or without a Fem. termination, but sometimes too they take the outer formation: **መንክር** “miracle”, **መንክራት**; in the same way **መድምም**, **መፍቅድ**; **መሥመር** “line”, **መሥመራት**; **መዝሙር** “psalm”, **መክርይ** “spade”, **መንኰራዝር** “wheel”⁽¹⁾: **መቅሠፍት** “castigation”, **መቅሠፍታት**; **መቅፁት** “pot”, **መቅፁታት**; **ማዕፈርት** “mitre”, **ማዕፈርታት**. In others the outer formation appears, as well as the inner: **ማኅፈድ** “tower”, **ጥገድ** “flood”, **ማኅደር** “dwelling” (**ማኅደራት** Hen. 59, 2), **ማእከር** “bond”, **መልሀቅ** “principalship” (**መልሀቃት** *Gad, Lalib.*); **ማሕሌት**, **ማዕጠንት**, **መሥዋዕት**. There are, besides, a few of the Feminine Stems cited towards the end of § 111, a,—having **ት** prefixed,—which admit of the outer formation: **ተምኔት** “wish”, **ተምኔታት**; **ትእምርት** “mark or sign”, “miracle”, **ትእምርታት**; **ትፍሥሕት** “joy”, **ትፍሥሕታት**; **ትውልድ** “race”, “family”, **ትውልዳት**.—**ትንቢት** “prophecy” forms, in accordance with § 133 b, α, **ትንቢያት**.

Nominal
Stems with
Prefix መ,
which
sometimes
take the
Outer For-
mation in
the Plural.

On a farther employment of the termination *āt*, v. § 141.

(b). *Inner Formation of the Plural.*

§ 135. Agreeably to the natural bent of the Semitic languages to replace the Outer formation by Inner vowel-change, an Inner Plural-formation has been also developed from the Outer⁽²⁾. The lengthening and broadening of the terminal sounds, by means of which the Plural-forms, given in §§ 132—134, have come into being, may be turned into a lengthening and broadening of the inner vowel-utterances of the Stem. Just as happens in forming the Imperfect (§ 91) and the Feminine of certain Descriptive words, *i. e.*, Adjectives and Participles (§ 129), so, in order to construct a Collective word out of the word which denotes one of a class, a long or short *a*, more rarely a *u*, penetrates into the middle of the Stem as a kind of remains of the Feminine Plural termination *āt* or the Masculine *ān* (*ōn*), occasionally dislodging *a*-sounds of the Singular Stem and turning them into prefixes. This formation of new Collective-words by means of inner vowel-change, is therefore only a continuation of the process of Nominal Stem-formation;

General
Account of
the Inner
Plural or
Collective
Form.

(¹) Cf. also **ምጽናዕ** “firmament”, **ምጽንዓት** and **ምጽናዓት**.

(²) V. on the other hand KÖNIG, p. 86 sq.

and since the language regards and treats the new forms not as properly words indicating several individuals, but as abstract Collective words, they are with more propriety denominated *Collective-forms* than *Plural-forms*. In the multiplicity of these Collective formations Ethiopic approaches Arabic, in which precisely this tendency of the language luxuriates most; but even here it again exhibits its more frugal disposition in the development and use of forms; and inasmuch as it employs only the most important of possible types of this formation, it is well calculated to elucidate the complicated Arabic system. All these Collective words, as falling under the general notion of Abstracts, may be conceived of in Ethiopic as feminine, and they sometimes even have in their formation a feminine ት⁽¹⁾. In the usage of the language, they may —whether with or without a feminine termination—be treated either as masculine or as feminine, just like the ordinary Abstract (§ 130). Farther, in their character of Collective words, they may be regarded either as notions suggestive of unity, and be associated with a Singular in the Predicate and the Apposition,—or as notions suggestive of a number of individuals comprised in them, and accordingly be connected with a Plural in these parts of the sentence. Thus, for example, the expression “those days” may be rendered either by ው-እቱ : መዋዕል or by ይእቲ : መዋዕል or እመ-ንቱ : መዋዕል or እማንቱ : መዋዕል.

The formation of a Collective itself is invariably regulated by the form of the Singular-stem, and accordingly such Collective formation falls into three main divisions:—(1) Forms from triliteral Nominal Stems of the simplest kind; (2) Forms from longer Stems, especially from Stems of tri-radical roots containing a long formative vowel after the first or second radical, from stems with outer additions in the shape of Prefixes or Affixes, and from Stems of Multiliteral roots; (3) Special Forms, standing midway between these two divisions, of certain Descriptive words and *Nomina agentis*.—Several Nominal Stems have a two-fold or threefold Collective formation,—for the most part, however, without any difference in meaning. Alongside of these leading modes of the Collective formation, which are still active in the language as used,

(1) Not *āt*, which would of necessity turn them into words expressing a number of individuals, *i. e.* into Plurals.

there occur in rare instances remains of other formations, still preserved in Arabic, which indicate that at one time Ethiopic also had a greater number of forms, but parted with the use of them, with characteristic frugality. On the accentuation of these Collective-forms in general, cf. TRUMPP, p. 542 and KÖNIG, p. 159.

§ 136. I. *Collective words from Singular-stems of the simplest formation from Tri-radical roots.* To this class belong only Singular-stems without the Feminine termination *at* or *t*; for the Fem. Stems (with the exception of አመት, ሥዕርት, ክረምት, ፍኖት, ስኩት) take the outer form of the Plural (§ 133, *b*) or have other Collective forms. Then, Singular-stems of the types ግብር, ግብር and ገብር do not appear in this class, because the first of these three types has generally no plural at all or at most only an outer plural, while the other two types, in accordance with § 134, *c*, *α*, confine themselves to the outer Plural form. Accordingly the Singular-stems which fall to be considered here are those after the types ግብር, ገብር, ገብር, as well as a few Stems of the type ጋብር following the type ገብር.

I. Collective Words from Singular-Stems of the Simplest Formation from Tri-radical Roots:—

1. *The first and simplest Collective-form, Type ግብር, comes from Singular-stems of the type ግብር and is produced by establishing short á after the second radical, which is vowel-less in the Sing.* Judging by the Arabic⁽¹⁾, we might even have this *a* lengthened; as yet, however, *ā* can be supported only in the case of ቀዳጽ from ቀዳጽ “leg” (Cant. 5, 15; John 19, 31, together with አቀዳጽ Ps. 146, 11; Judges 15, 8) and ፍኖው, ፍኖፔ⁽²⁾ from ፍኖት “way”. For short *a* v. e. g. እዝን “ear”, እዘን; *mediae geminatae*:—ሕግ “law”, ሕግግ; ግብ “pit”, ግብብ; *tertiæ infirmæ*: ሥርው “root”, ሥረው. Farther, this formation is specially adopted by these old and much abbreviated words (§ 105 *ad fin.*): አብ “father”, እኑ “brother”, እድ “hand”, አፍ “mouth”, ዕድ “man”, ዕፅ “tree”,—in which *u* appears as third radical: አበው, አኅው (§ 44), እደው, አፈው, ዕደው, ዕፀው. The names of the parts of the body in men and animals frequently have this form of the Plural: ብርክ “knee”, እዝን “ear”, (ቀዳጽ), ሕፅን “bosom”, እግር “foot”, ክንፍ “wing”, ጽፍር “nail”, ጥርስ = ዕርስ “molar tooth”; and besides these:

1. Collective form, Type ግብር (*gəbār*).

(1) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 307.

(2) [If this form is not rather to be compared with Arabic فَعَالِي; cf. PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVI, p. 694.]

ሕዝብ, **ትልም**, **እብን**, **ጽንፍ**, **ሕብር** “colour”, **ምስል**, **ቀስል**, **ጉልቀ**, (Plur. **ጉለቀ**), **እጉል**, **ዕቀር**, **ግብር**, **ግድም**, **ጥንፍ**. **አፈው** “frankincense” may also be a *Plurale tantum*. Yet many of these words admit also of the Plural-type **አግባር** (v. *infra* No. 2):—**ሥርወ**, **ቀይጽ**, **ትልም**, **እብን**, **ብርክ**, **ክንፍ**, **እዝን**, **እግር**, **ግብ**, **ጽንፍ**, **ጽፍር**, and **ሕዝብ**, one plural of which, **ሕዝብ** signifies “tribes”, and the other **አሕዛብ** “nations”:—there is a similar result in the case of **ዕዕ**, v. *infra*. That this type **ግብር** was at one time exchangeable for another type **فَعِيل** or **فُعُول** cannot be proved. **ደቂቅ** “sons”, which is always employed in a Plural sense and which therefore might easily be regarded as a Plural of **ደቅ**, is rather a Singular used as a Collective (§ 131, 2), as the mode of attachment of the Suff. Pron. indicates. In the same way **ወለድ** “children” appears to be both the Plur. belonging to **ወልድ** and also a Passive Part. used as a Collective; but yet in certain passages it seems to denote “son” in the Singular (Gen. 17, 16; 18, 10 & 14; Cant. 5, 10). In like manner **ዕድው**⁽¹⁾ “men” (Ps. 138, 18) might be conceived as a Collective Singular (instead of the usual **ዕድ**)⁽²⁾: So long, however, as such a type of the Singular is not otherwise supported, it may perhaps be permitted to regard **ዕድው** ‘*edēwwe*’ as rather a Plural, of the type **فُعُول** (for **ዕድው**, like **أَخَو** “brothers”).

2. Collective-
form, Type
አግባር
(*agbár*).

2. A second Collective formation, and the one in fact which is most frequently found with all Singular-Stems of Simple form, takes *á* after the second radical, and **አ** as a Stem-prefix forming one syllable with the first radical, but never lengthened before Aspirates: Type **አግባር**. This form is adopted first of all by Singular-Stems which contain an *a*-sound, in particular by those which have an *a* after the second radical. Accordingly the prefixed **አ** may be considered as an *a* of the Singular-Stem which has been thrust out of the stem by the interpolated *ā*. Singular-Stems,

(¹) Cf. also LUDOLF's Note on Ps. 72, 5.

(²) [DILLMANN gives a very different account of this word in his ‘*Lex.*’ Under **ዕድ** he says (*col.* 1011):—“Ps. 54, 27. 138, 18 exhibent **ዕድው**: **ደም**: *hostes sanguinolenti*, quamquam primitus sine dubio **ዕድው**: **ደም**: *legebatur*; cfr. etiam Ludolfi annot. ad Ps. 72, 5”; and, again, under **ዕድው** *adversarius* (*col.* 1012)—“In libris Mss. passim **ዕድው**: cum **ዕድው**: *viri* perperam permutatur”. TR.]

which contain no *a*, share also in this formation, but only as a series of secondary importance. Very seldom indeed does this form take the Feminine termination ት. The intruding *a* is always long, with the exception of አዕፀው “trees” (along with ዕፀው) from ዕዕ (and አፍዖት v. *infra*).

(a) This Collective form is the one used almost exclusively in the case of Singular-Stems of the type ገብር⁽¹⁾, e. g.: ነገር “speech”, አንጋር “languages”; ዘነብ “tail”, አዝናብ; ደወል “district”, አድዋል; and in like manner: ፈለግ, ሐመር, መጠን, ሰመር, ቀለም, በለስ, በሐኑ, ነገድ, ከፈር, ዐጸድ, ዘመን, ዘመድ, ዘፈር, ገመል, ጸወን, ፈረስ.

(b) It is very common in the case of the Sing.-form ገብር (from which, it is true, the Collective forms አግብርት and አግብር also are often taken, v. *infra*):—ዐምድ “column”, አዕማድ; ደብር “mountain”, አድብር; *mediae geminatae*: ሠቅ “sack”, አሥቃቅ; ፀር “enemy”, አፅራር; *primae vocalis*: ወርህ “month”, አውራህ; ወይን “wine”, አውያን “vines”; *mediae infirmæ*: ያም “tree”, አዕዋም; ያፍ “bird”, አዕዋፍ; ቤት “house”, አብያት. Besides: ሐብል, ሜስ, ሠርቅ, ሠርግ, ሦክ, ረምሕ, ረድእ, ሰርም, ሶር, ሰውጥ, ቀምሕ, ቤዝ, ጎምል, አንፍ: ወቅፍ, ወትር, ወጽብ, ዐውድ, ዐይግ, ዐድል, ዘውግ, ደይም, ገልዕ, ጎር, ጾም, ፈትል. አርባብ⁽²⁾ “myriads” (from ጳጳ) is a *Plurale tantum*. The plural of ሣእን “shoe”, አሥአን is also written (§ 47) አሣእን (v. Gen. 14, 23 Note). The words ሐቅል “field”, ሰይፍ “sword”, ሣእን “shoe”, በትር “rod” have, along with this Plural, other forms in addition: አሕቃል and አሕቅልት; አስያፍ and አስያፍት; አሥአን and አሥእን; አብታር (Numb. 17, 17) and አብትር.

(c) But this Collective-form has also come into use in the case of the Singular-form ግብር, and with even greater frequency than No. 1,—a circumstance which is the less remarkable, that many words vary even in the Sing. between the types ግብር and ገብር. Thus ልብስ “garment” takes አልባስ in the Plur.; ምድር “land”, አምዳር; ዕንቁ “precious stone”, አዕናቁ; ምእት “hundred”, አምአት; ልብ “heart”, አልባብ; ምት “husband”, አምታት; ቢጽ

(1) Only a few have the Collective-form አግቡር (§ 137), and a few again take the outer formation (§ 134, γ).

(2) [Again a retreat from the position taken up in the ‘Lex.’, and an acknowledgement that LUDOLF was right. TR.]

“companion”, **አብያጽ**; **እድ** “hand”, **አእዳው**, as a side-form to the usual **እደው**; **ሥርው** “root”, **አሥራው**; **ጽሕም** “beard”, **አጽሓም**. In the same way (besides those already mentioned under No. 1): **ሕልም**, **ርግብ**, **ብርዕ**, **ንህብ**, **እልፍ**, **ክፍል**, **ድርዕ**, **ጉንድ**, **ጥን**, **ጽርሕ**, **ጽድፍ**, **ፍሕም**; and from a Feminine Singular-Stem **ክረምት** “winter”, **አክራም** (along with the outer form **ክራማት**, § 133, *b, α*). To this section perhaps belongs also the *Plurale tantum* **አንጻር** “view”.

Very seldom does a Feminine termination occur with this second Collective-form. It is possible (in accordance with § 36) in words from roots *tertiæ gutturalis*:—**አቅማሕት** ἡ ὀπώρα (Rev. 18, 14), from **ቀምሕ**⁽¹⁾. Farther, from **ሐጽ** “arrow” (*V* **ሐጽዩ**; cf. ሃጥ), **አሕጻት**: So too from **ጥብ** “the female breast” (originally *tertiæ infirmæ*) **አጥባት**, and from **ስም** “name”, **አስማት**. From **ፈዐው** “adder” (*tertiæ infirmæ*) comes the Plur. **አፍዖት** (ት being applied to **አፍዐው**, from **አፍዓው**)⁽²⁾. In **አመት** “maid-servant” and **ሰኩት** or **ሰኩት** “street”, the fem. **ት** is treated as belonging to the root, whence **አእማት** and **አስካት** or **አስካት**⁽³⁾.

3. Collective-
form, Type
አግቡር
(*agbūr*).

§ 137. 3. A third Collective formation, but one which was already decidedly dying out, contains an accented (TRUMPP, p. 542) *ū* after the second radical, and,—like No. 2,—**አ** as a prefix, Type **አግቡር**⁽⁴⁾. This form is adopted by several words indicating per-

(1) But **አፅባኢት** “wars”, from **ፀብኢ**,—which LUDOLF quotes in his ‘Lex.’, col. 606, in accordance with his ‘Gramm.’ p. 108,—should be amended into **አፅባኢት**, a doubled Plural. [But yet PLATT retains the reading (in Mark. 13, 7) which LUDOLF quotes, and so does PRAETORIUS in the reprint. TR.] So too, in Judges 8, 26, the word is not **አውጸብት**, as LUDOLF quotes it in the ‘Lex.’, but **አውጸባት**, a doubled Plural.

(2) Cf. PRAETORIUS, ‘Amh. Spr.’ p. 189.

(3) [A peculiar use of this second formation,—viz. its employment to form the inner plural of singulars representing the Arabic elative **أَفْعُل**,—is exhibited in a passage of the *Kebra Nag.* (74 b 23 sq.): **አፍራጽ** : **በአስዋድ** : **አሕማር** : **በአብያድ** : **አክጻር** “precious stones, red ones along with black, and dark-brown with white ones”, the respective singulars (**أحمر**, **أسود**, **أبيض**, **أكدر**) being directly imported from Arabic.]

(4) In Arabic, **أَفْعُل**,—which in Ethiopic must have the sound of **አግቡር**,—does not correspond so well as does **فُعُول**: Cf. D. H. MÜLLER,

sons, and by those notions which are usually apprehended as Masculine,—which fact perhaps explains the presence of the vowel *ū* instead of *ā*:—**አድግ** “ass”, **አእዱግ**; **ሐቅል** “field”, **አሕቁል** (as well as **አሕቃል** and **አሕቅልት**); **ዐጽቅ** “bough”, **አዕጹቅ** (عُدُوق); **ሐጽር** “fence”, **አሕጹር**; **ሐረግ** “vine-shoot”, **አሕሩግ**; **ሀገር** “city” and “country”, **አሀጉር** (**አሀጉር**); **ገመስ** ‘small copper coin’, **አግመስ**. Without Singular:—**አይሁድ** “Jews”, **አዕኑግ** “ear-rings”;—and from a lost Singular, **አእሩግ** “old men” (used as Plur. for **አረጋዊ**)⁽¹⁾.

4. A fourth Collective formation contains short *e* (at first 4. Collective probably *ū*) after the second radical, and likewise **አ** as a Stem- form, Type prefix⁽²⁾:—Type **አግብር**. This form is rather less frequent even **አግብር** than the foregoing one, and seems to have been supplanted partly by (*āgbēr*). No. 2, partly by No. 5. The most of the words which adopt it have another Plural-form besides:—**ወግር** “hill”, **አወግር** (*āüger*); **ቁጽል** “leaf”, **አቀጽል**⁽³⁾; **ቦትር** “rod”, **አብትር** (and **አብታር**); **ኀስል** “sack”, **አኀስል** (and **አኀሳል** Gen. 42, 25; 43, 22; 44, 1); **ንጥር** and **ነጥር** “gleam”, **አንጥር**; **ጻሕል** “bowl”, **አጽሕል** (and **አጽሕልት**); **ባቅል** “mule”, **አባቅል** (and **አባቅልት**); **ሣእን** “shoe”, **አሥእን** (and **አሥእን**). The Plur. **አሕርው** “swine” (*ahréwue*) belongs probably to a lost Sing. **ሐርው**; in the Sing. the form **ሐራውያ** is used (Ps. 79, 14; Lev. 11, 7)⁽⁴⁾, which no doubt is also a Collective.

5. Of much more frequent occurrence, however, and, next to 5. Collective No. 2 of this Class, the form in most general use,—is the form **አግብርት** form, Type (*āgbért*).

ZDMG XXXVII, p. 366. It is remarkable that nearly all words of this form come from roots *primae gutturalis*.

(1) On **አእኑስ** cf. DILLMANN'S ‘Lex.’, col. 771.

(2) **أَنْعَلَ** answers in Arabic.—On the Accentuation cf. TRUMPP p. 542.

(3) Not **ቁጽል**, as LUDOLF has it in his ‘Lex.’. [What LUDOLF has in his ‘Lex.’, (col. 221) under this word **ቁጽል**, is the following:—“Pl. **አቀጽል**: Marc. 11, 8, & **ቁጽል**: Deut. 12, 2”. LUDOLF was thus well aware of the pl.-form which is given in the ‘Grammar’ here; and as for the other plural form **ቁጽል**, which he cites, Prof. BEZOLD communicates a conjecture that “most probably LUDOLF'S **ቁጽል** is a misprint for **ቀጽል**, which actually occurs as plur. in *Kebra Nag.* 93 b 17”. TR.]

(4) [Cf. also Tab. Tab. 59 (Chrest. p. 121) and also TRUMPP, ZDMG XXXIV, p. 236 sq., and CORNILL *ibid.* XXXV, p. 650. Also Cod. Mon. Aeth. 11, fol. 48 v⁰ reads there **ወለሐራውያ**.]

just dealt with, 4, increased by the Fem. termination ት:—Type **አግብርት** ⁽¹⁾.

(a) This form is taken only in a few cases by the Singular-Stem of the type **ግብር: ርእስ** “head”, **አርእስት**; **ንስር** “eagle”, **አንስርት**; **ዝእብ** “wolf”, **አዝእብት**; **ንህብ** “bee”, **አንህብት** (as well as **አንሃብ**) (say *ansért* &c.).

(b) The form is usually found in connection with the Singular-Stem of type **ግብር**, or even from **ጋብር: ዐይን** “eye”, **አዐይንት**; **በድን** “corpse”, **አብድንት**; **ባሕር** “sea”, **አብሕርት**. In the same fashion:—**ፋእም**, **ማእስ**, **በቀል**, **ተክል**, **ነምር** ⁽²⁾, **ነቅዕ**, **ነትዕ**, **ከልብ**, **ዐጽም**, **ዐጽፍ**, **ዘርእ**, **ገልዕ**, **ገብር**, **ጸልዕ**, **ጸኅብ**, **ፀርቅ**, **ፀርዕ** and **ፅርዕ**, **ፈትል**. Also, from **ሐቅል** “field” (v. No. 3), **በቅል** “mule” (v. No. 4), **ጸሕል** “bowl” (v. No. 4), **ሰይፍ** “sword” (v. No. 2). From **ቀስት** “bow” comes **አቅስት** (for **አቅስትት**), ት being considered as a radical. From unknown Singular-forms:—**አምትንት** “sinews”, **አሥህርት** “new-moons”; **አፍርኅት** “the young of birds” (أَفْرَحَة, **ወገንዳጽ**): probably also **አውስት** “birds of prey” (Hen. 89,10 ⁽³⁾; 90,2; 96,2 for **አዕውስት** from **ወገን**, **عائث**): From **ላህም** “ox”, **አልህምት**; **ረድእ** “helper”, **አርድእት** (as well as **አርዳእ**); **ባዕል** “rich”, **አብዕልት**; **መርሕ** “guide”, “leader”, **አምርሕት**; **ዐርክ** “friend”, **አዐርክት**. Also the word **ከይሲ** “serpent”, may form, from **ከይስ**,—the ending *i* being left out of account (§ 118),—the plural **አክይስት**, and in contracted form **አኪስት** (Hen. 20,7) ⁽⁴⁾, while from **ከይሲ** **አክይስት** is formed (§ 140). In like manner **ዐንበሳ** “lion” (§ 131) forms **ዐንብስት** (from **ዐንበስ**, without prefixed **አ**, because **ዐ** is taken for **አ**, the formative bent having here proved misleading). **ሥዕርት** “hair” ⁽⁵⁾ forms (from **ሣዕር**) **አሥዕርት**.

(1) Arabic **أَفْعَلَة**.—On the accentuation v. TRUMPF, p. 543.

(2) [The plural of this word is given in ‘*Lex.*’ as **አናምርት**, but **አንምርት** is also given there on LUDOLF’s authority. TR.]

(3) [FLEMMING reads in 89,10 **አንስርት** instead of DILLMANN’s **አውስት**. TR.]

(4) [FLEMMING reads here **አክይስት** instead of DILLMANN’s **አኪስት**, besides adopting certain other slight variants of form and order. TR.]

(5) As if **ሥዕርት** were a *nomen unitatis* (§ 131) and **ሣዕር** or **ሥዕር** were only derived. But in point of fact **ሥዕርት** is used quite as readily in a Collective sense, Ps. 39,17, as in an Individual sense, Matt. 5,36.—**አንግጽ**

§ 138. II. *Collective words from certain longer Singular-Stems of tri-radical roots.* Several Descriptive words of the type given in § 108, *b, c*, as well as those Adjectives and *Nomina agentis* which have been formed by doubling the Second radical (§ 117), have a peculiar formation, differing from the Collective-forms of the other longer Singular-Stems. That formation is brought about by the essential vowel of the Singular-Stem after the second radical being superseded by a short *a*, the fem. **ት** being appended at the same time. To this *a* and **ት** the force of a Collective Abstract becomes attached. Moreover the transformation which passes over the Ground-Stem is so marked that this Collective-form looks more like a new formation directly out of the root:—Type **ገበርት**⁽¹⁾.

II.
Collective
Words
from
certain
longer
Singular-
Stems,—the
Collective-
form being
of the Type
ገበርት
(*gäbärt*.)

1. This form comes into use most frequently in the case of Singular-Stems of the type **ገበረ**. For these it is the only practicable type of a Collective formation, and meanwhile it occurs oftener than the outer Plural-formation (§ 132, *g*). If it is allowable to come to a conclusion as to Ethiopic, from that which is observed in Arabic, then we may assume that, in forming the Collective in these cases, the doubling of the second radical is given up (as in **أَكْبَرُ** from **كَبَرُ**), although it has as yet been impossible to prove this from Ethiopic itself; cf. TRUMPP, p. 543⁽²⁾. Examples:—**ቀዳሚ** “the first”, **ቀደምት** (*qadāmt*); **ጸሓፊ** “writer”, “scribe”, **ጸሐፍት**; **ሰያፊ** “swordbearer”, **ሰየፍት**; **ሐላዩ** “singer”, **ሐለይት**; **ነፃዊ** “hunter”, **ነፃውት** (*na‘aūt*). But in words *tertiæ gutturalis* we have:—**ሠዋሒ** “sacrificer”, “priest”, **ሠዋዕት**; and from roots with final **ጠ** or **ደ**:—**መሰጠ** “rapacious”, **መሰጥ**; **ዐፃዲ** “reaper”, **ዐፀድ** (§ 54). The same formation occurs in the case of **ኅላፊ**, **ኅዳሪ**, **ነጻኢ**, **ሰራቂ**, **ከጻኒ**, **ወቃሪ**, **ወጣኒ**, **ዐቃቢ**, **ገባኢ**, **ጸላኢ**, **ጸረቢ**, and others. It is also met with, along with the outer formation, in **ሐራሲ**, **መጋቢ**, **ሰማኢ**, **ቀታሊ**, **ቀዳሐ**, **ወዓሊ**, **ዐጸዊ**, **ደኃሪ**,

“condition of a foreigner” and “foreigner” (from a Sing. **ነገድ**) seems to be based upon a corresponding form in Arabic **أَفْعِلَاءَ**.

(1) The corresponding form in Arabic is **فَعْل** or **فَعْلَة**, EWALD ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 312.

(2) V. on the other hand KÖNIG, p. 95.

ገሰፊ. **ገኖዊ** “priest of false gods”⁽¹⁾ forms **ገነውት** and, with the mixed sound, **ገኖት**; so too **ኖላዊ** “shepherd” (from the original root ነገጥ + *āwī*) takes **ኖሎት** (for **ኖለውት**), as if **ወ** were a part of the root. Compare also **ጠንቋሊ** “soothsayer”, **ጠንቁልት**. Farther, the name **ረዐይት** “giants” is no doubt to be derived from a Sing. **ረዓዩ**, thus originally “shepherds”, “shepherd people”.

2. A few Descriptive words, having *i* after the second radical, also adopt this formation (as well as the outer formation, § 132, 1, *b*); **ቀጢን** “thin”, **ቀጠንት**; **ጠቢብ** “wise”, **ጠብብት**; **ዐቢይ** “big”, **ዐበይት**: So too the Substantive **ሐቢ** “warranter”, **ሐበይት**; in contrast with which, other Substantives of this type have the formation given in § 140. Finally, the much abbreviated word **ማሪ** “seer” (§ 114, *c*) has **ማረይት** (as well as **ማርያን** and **ማርያት**).

3. Of the Participle-type **ግብር**, **ቅድው** “pure”, “genuine” has this formation, **ቀድውት**, unless it be really founded upon a Singular **ቀዲው**. And thus too **ነገሥት** “kings” might be derived from **ንጉሥ**, and it would be unnecessary to refer it to the Singular **ነጋሢ** which has become of rare occurrence in Ethiopic⁽²⁾.

III.
Collective
Words
from longer
Stems of
Triliteral
and
Multiliteral
Roots:—
Type
ገሳርር
(*gābārēr*).

§ 139. III. *Collective Words from longer Stems of Triliteral and Multiliteral Roots have but one single type*:—long *ā* after the third-last strong Stem-letter; before it a syllable with a short *a*, which only very seldom is reduced to *e* (or in Quinqueliteral Stems two syllables with two short *a*'s), and after it a syllable with a short *e* (§ 60)⁽³⁾:—Type **ገሳርር**. This type is followed by all Nominal Stems of Multiliteral roots⁽⁴⁾; by all Stems of Triliteral roots formed by external increase⁽⁴⁾; and lastly by several

(1) It is a matter of doubt whether this word is to be derived from the root **ገነወ**=**ገነዩ** or from **ጋኔን**, جَنَّ + *āwī*=جَنِّي.

(2) **ማውታ**,—which appears frequently in the phrase **እንለ: ማውታ** “orphans”, and also in another connection in Lev. 11, 40, and Deut. 14, 21, Note,—is a word *sui generis*. I recognise in this word the Collective form فَعْلَى (EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 313). **ማውታ** answers completely to the Arabic مَوْتَى from مَيِّت, so that **እንለ: ማውታ** means literally: “children of those who are dead”. But **ጠራው** “Pleiades” is merely the Ethiopic pronunciation of ثَوْرِيَا.

(3) Just as in Arabic, EWALD, ‘Gr. Ar.’ § 314.

(4) With the exception of those which take the outer Plural formation.

monly applied externally to Collective Stems which end in the Fem. ት:—አላህምት, አላህምታት; but when the Collective Stem ends in *ūt*, the form *wāt* is preferred to *ūtāt*, although the former is not absolutely binding (§ 133, *b, α*):—አማዑት, አማዕዋት; መፃፂት, መፃፃዋት⁽¹⁾.

III. FORMATION OF CASES.

§ 142. The various relations, upon which a Noun may enter in the course of a sentence, — commonly called *Cases* —, are represented in Ethiopic, just as in Semitic languages generally, only by a small number of special formations. A noun takes its place in a sentence, either without being dependent, — in other words as Subject, — or as dependent, whether on a Verb as Object, or on another noun as a Genitive. On these three leading positions, assumable by a Noun in the sentence, rest the Cases which are possible in Semitic languages generally, and which in Arabic, — the most perfect of these languages in this respect, — have received the impress of special Forms. These Cases are: the *Nominative*, — which may also be regarded as including a second species of the independent Noun, viz. the Noun when used in address, or the *Vocative*; the *Accusative*; and the *Genitive*. All those farther relations of a Noun in the Sentence, which are indicated in other languages by various other Case-forms, must in the Semitic tongue be either expressed with the help of Prepositions, — in particular the Dative by means of the Preposition ለ (§ 164), — or made up for by a wider application of the relational powers inherent in the Accusative and Genitive. But even these four Cases, which alone are possible in Semitic, have been by no means completely developed in all Semitic languages; and in Ethiopic some of these Cases have received only a partial development⁽²⁾.

1. The
Nominative
and
Vocative.

1. The *Nominative*, as the Subject-Case, has by way of antithesis the Accusative as the Object-Case. As Subject-Case it

⁽¹⁾ A remarkable form is the irregular አኅመልማላት (LUDOLF, 'Lex.' col. 274) which LUDOLF derives from ኅመልማል. [V. also, on a few Plur.-Plur. Forms not yet registered in the Lexicon, *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XVIII.]

⁽²⁾ In ZDMG XXXIV, p. 758 HAUPT very properly opposes the view put forward by HOMMEL, — that the original Semitic had a distinction of Cases.

2 Collective-
forms from
Nominal
Stems
which have
Prefixes
(a—c).

2. *All Nominal Stems formed by means of Prefixes and belonging to Tri-radical Roots*, follow this Collective formation, viz.:—

(a) *Nominal Stems having **አ** prefixed*, however it may have originated:—**አንብዕ** “tear”, **አናብዕ**; **አንበጣ** “locust”, **አናበጥ**; **አንቀጽ** “door”, **አናቀጽ**: And with Feminine-ending (Names indicating Persons, and Names of Animals):—**አምሐው** “ancestor”, **አማሐት** (for **አማሐውት**); **አንጼዋ** “mouse”, **አናጼት**; **አምላክ** “God” (although itself a Collective-form, § 136, 2). **አማልክት**. A theological term has been introduced from the Syriac through the Arabic (from **مَلَكُوت**, *Ar. Pl.* **أَقَانِيمُ**), viz. **አቃኒም** “essence”, “substance”.

(b) *Nominal Stems having **ት** as prefix* (rare): **ትእምርት** “sign”, **ተአምር**; **ትዕይንት** “camp”, **ተዓይን**.

(c) *Nominal Stems in great number formed by prefixing **መ***. *Participles and Nomina agentis*, it is true, have mostly the outer Plural formation (§ 132 f.), but sometimes also the inner, and indeed (being Personal-words) taking that form with **ት** appended: **መምክር** “counsellor”, **መማክርት**; **መስፍን** “prince”, **መሳፍንት**; **መቅርን** “trumpeter”, **መቃርንት**; **ሞረክ** “joint-heir”, **መዋርክት**; **መፅርር** “mischief-maker”, **መፃርርት**; **መኰንን** “judge”, **መኳንንት**. On the other hand **መትልው** “he who follows”, “successor”, forms **መታልው** without **ት**. Names of localities also, of the type **ምግባር**,—which mostly take the outer Plural, in accordance with § 134, c, α,—participate to some extent in this Collective formation: **ምኩራብ** “temple” (**مَكْرَاب**), **መኳርብት**; **ምዕማድ** “base of a column”, **መዓምድ**.

This form rules almost exclusively in the case of the remaining words which are formed by prefixing **መ**, § 116; and then those Singular-stems, which have not the sign of the Feminine, generally take **ት** in the Collective-form, especially Personal-words: **መልአክ** “ambassador”, **መላእክት**; **መንፈስ** “spirit”, **መናፍስት**; **መርጥ** “key”, **መራጥት**; **ሞሣእ** “antiphone”, **መዋሥእት**; **መከፍድ** “stool”, **መክፍድ**. On the other hand we meet with **ማሕፀን** “mother’s lap”, **መሐፅን** (Gen. 49, 25); **ማሕስእ** “a young one” (‘lamb or kid’ &c.), **መሐስእ**; **ማኅደር** “dwelling”, **መኅደር**; or with double form: **መብረቅ** “lightning”, **መባርቅ** and **መባርቅት**; **መንበር** “throne”, **መት**

ክል “nail”, &c.⁽¹⁾. Feminine Singular-stems generally take the Masculine form in the Collective: **መሥገርት** “net”, **መሣገር**; **መልታሕት** “jaw”, **መላትሕ**; **መዐልት** “day”, (from **ዋዐልት**), **መዋዕል**; **መንሱት** “temptation”, **መናስው** (*manāsew^e* or *manāsaw^e*); **መስከት** “window”, **መሳክው**; **መድሎት** “weight”, **መዳልው**; **መክሊት** “a talent”, **መክልይ** (*makāly^e* for *makāley^e*) or **መክሊ**; **መጽሔት** “mirror”, **መጽሕይ**; **መርዔት** “herd”⁽²⁾, **መራዕይ** (*marā’y^e* for *marā’ey^e*). Very rarely do they take the Fem. form then, as in **መርበብት** “net”, **መራብብት**. Oftener they have both forms side by side: **መጥባሕት** “knife”, **መጥባሕ** and **መጥባሕት**; and in the same way **መንቅፅት**, **ዋጻሕት**. This occurs with special frequency when the Sing. has already both Masc. and fem. forms: **መትከፍ** and **መትከፍት** “region of the shoulder”, **መታከፍ** and **መታከፍት**; in like manner **ማዕጾ** and **ማዕጾት** “lock of a door”; **መጽወር** and **መጽወርት** “carrying pole” &c.

From Quinqueliteral and longer Stems: **መሌሊት** “joint”, **መለያልይ**; **መስንቆ** “cithara”, **መስናቅው** and **መስናቁት**; **መንጦላዕት** “curtain or veil”, **መንጦዋልዕ** and **መንጦዋልዕት**.

§ 140. 3. *The same formation occurs with many Nominal Stems belonging to tri-radical roots, which have a long vowel after the first or second radical or have a Vowel-termination, as well as with those Stems which have been produced from Multiliterals by abbreviation. The language, by inserting or attaching semivowels or by employing አ as a Stem-prefix, endeavours in various ways to enlarge these Stems, which generally have too small a number of firm letters to be capable of taking in the three syllables a-ā-e, the last of which must be a shut syllable. The choice of the means adopted in such a case is usually guided by the form of the Singular.*

3. Same Formation occurring with many Nom. Stems of Tri-rad. Roots which have a long Vowel after 1st or 2nd Rad., or have a Vowel-termination (a-c).

(a) In words which have *ī* or *ē* after the second radical, being originally Infinitives or Descriptive-words, two vowels come into contact, when *ā* is interpolated after the second radical and the *ī* or *ē* passes into *ě*. In that case the two vowels are first of all separated by means of the semivowel **ይ**⁽³⁾ taken from the *ī* or

⁽¹⁾ **መቃትልት** “opponent”, “enemy”, and **መናቅፅት** “counterpart” are to be conceived as *Pluralia tantum*.

⁽²⁾ **መርዓት** “bride” (*V 200*) forms **መራዕው**, but with the **ው** usually passing into **ይ**, **መራዕይ**.

⁽³⁾ It is the same in Arabic; EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 317.

\bar{e} ; and then \mathfrak{w} is usually substituted for this \mathfrak{p} in Ethiopic, in accordance with § 41. Thus from $\mathfrak{w}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}\text{-}\mathfrak{w}$ “river” we have still $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$ $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{t}$; from $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ “sin”, $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$ (Lev. 16, 16 Note; Josh. 24, 19); from $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{t}$ “cake”, $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$, with \mathfrak{p} , as also in the Arabic word $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$ “natural disposition” ($\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{h}$ from $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{h}$).—On the other hand \mathfrak{w} has been inserted in all other cases: $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ takes oftener the form $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$; $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}$ “iron”, $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{t}$ “iron tools”; $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$ “presbyter”, $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$. In like manner $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$, has $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$ ⁽¹⁾ and $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ (“Minutes” Hexaëm. p. 27, 1 *sqq.*). So too we have $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$ “dropped honey” ($\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$); $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$ “performing of marvels” ($\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{h}$); and $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ from $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$ “land”. But $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$ “lord”, which possesses a fourth firm letter in its prefixed \mathfrak{z} , throws off the \bar{e} without leaving a trace of it: $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ (§ 57). Similarly $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ “testicle” (§ 120) has $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ [according to LUDOLF] (and $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ Deut. 25, 11). The plural form $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ “doorkeeper” also seems to belong to the Sing. $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{h}$; cf. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 1022.

Words, having \bar{a} or \bar{u} after the second radical, follow the same formation. Thus $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$ “neck” has the form $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$ (and $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$), and $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ “girdle” has $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$, without even the interpolation of a in the first syllable. From $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{t}$ “field” comes $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$; from $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ “bread”, “loaf” (Fem. of $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{h}$) $\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$. On the other hand $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$ “blind” ($\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$), with the second radical doubled, has the form $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ (Matt. 15, 14 old ed.), and $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ “finger” has $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}$ ($\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{h}$). From the Pl. $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{h}$ “seniores”, “principals” comes a new Collective-form $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{t}$ (as a designation of office).

(b). Words which end in \bar{a} or \bar{at} , must first of all reduce this termination to \bar{e} or $\bar{e}y$, whether it has come from $\bar{a}w$, $\bar{a}wt$ or is merely a feminine termination; but in Ethiopic ew or ew is always employed instead and all the more readily, when,—as in several of these words,— a final radical \bar{u} has fallen out⁽²⁾. Thus $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{h}$

(1) This is the form also which is adopted by the editor of the Rom. N. T., TESFA-ZION [as is pointed out by LUDOLF in his ‘*Lex.*’ TR.]

(2) The corresponding Arabic formations in this case are $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{l}$ and $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{l}$, from $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{l}$ and $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{l}$. In $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}$ “ways” Lev. 26, 22; Deut. 28, 7 & 25;

“tent” has the form **ሰቃልው**; **ሰኩና** “sole of the foot”, **ሰኳንው**; **ተኬሳ** “shoulder-blade”, **ተክስው**; **ወሬዛ** “young man”, with fem.-ending **ወሬዙት**; **ወልታ** “shield”, **ወላትው**; **ዘብዳ** “hide”, “pelt”, **ዘባድው**; **ጾታ** “series”, **ጸዋትው**; **ጸዕዳ** “white”, **ጸዓድው**; **ሰሊዳ** “page” (of a book, *σελίδα* *Acc.*), **ሰላድው**; **ገበታ** “plate”, “platter”, **ገባትው**. From **ኩናት** “stabbing-weapon”, for which **ኩናት** is also used, come **ኩያንው** and **ኩያንው** (*cf. supra ክሳውድ*).

But words which end in a formative *ē* retain *ī* or *yē* in the Collective-form, without changing it into *we*; generally, however, they take the Fem.-ending at the same time: **ግምዔ** “pitcher” forms **ግምዕይ** (and **ግምዕው**) together with **ግምዔያት** and **ግምዓት**; while **ሰርዌ** “army”, **ኦርዌ** “beast”, **ሐርጌ** “ram”, have **ሰራዊት**, **ኦራዊት**, **ሐራጊት**. So too **ጐራዒት** “the region of the neck” (“neck”) is probably just a Collective form from **ጐርዒ** (*cf. ምገጽጽ*), and **ጸራዒት** “the region of the haunches”, a Plur. in like manner from a lost Sing. **ጸርዒ**.

(c). Several other Stems take **ከ** as a prefix, in order to possess four firm letters. Thus from **ጋኔን** “ghost” “demon” comes **ከጋንንት**; from **ብዕራይ** “draught animals” (*ጥጃ*), **ከባዕር**; and from **ከይሲ** “serpent”, **ከክይስት** (as well as **ከክይስት** § 137, 5, *b*), and in like manner **ከማዕት** “bowels”, from a lost Sing. (*cf. عَمِي, عَمَاء and ምጃ*). From **ጣዕዋ** “young of the flock” comes **ከጣዕዋ**, retaining the concluding *ā*⁽¹⁾ (*Hen.* 86, 2). Curiously enough, several tri-radical Stems even, of the simplest formation, take this Collective-form⁽²⁾: **ነክዕ** “rust in grain”, **ኦናኩዕ** and **ኦናኳዕ** “insects that injure the grain”; **በግዕ** and **በግዕት** “sheep”, **ኦበግዕት** and **ኦበግዕ**; **ጠሊ** and **ጠሊት** “goat”, **ኦጣሊ**; **ነምር** “tiger” (besides **ኦንምርት** § 137, 5, *b*), **ኦናምርት**⁽³⁾. Farther, **ወለት** “daughter” takes the form **ከዋልድ**.

IV. A much simpler kind of Collective formation, which

Judges 5, 6; 20, 32 (from **ፍና**), a fem.-ending *ē* is attached (*عِن*): *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 319 sq.

(¹) *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 319.

(²) Just as in the Arabic *أَفْعُل, أَرْض*, EWALD, § 318.

(³) These formations may be regarded as constituting a new Collective form taken from the most obvious Collective form, such as **ኦንክዕ**, **ኦበጋዕ** &c., just like **ኦማልክት** “gods”, from **ኦምላክ**.

IV. Traces of a Collective Formation, contrived by applying Abstract Terminations proper to Fem. Sing. however is now recognisable in Ethiopic only by a few remains, is produced by the use of *Abstract terminations proper to the Fem. Sing.* Thus from the professional designation ከንዩ “artificer” (§ 133, *a*, Note), the Collective may be formed externally, as ከንዮት (v. *supra*), but also with the termination *at* coming into the place of *yā*, as ከነት and ከነት. From ዳፍንት “cake baked under hot ashes” comes the Collective ዳፍንታ (v. Gen. 18, 6, Note). In particular the termination *yā*, *iyā* (§ 120), which has been derived from the relative pronoun, is employed for this purpose⁽¹⁾: አንስት “woman” may, like ብእሴ “man”, be itself used as a Collective; but when the Plural has to be expressed definitely, the forms አንስቲያ and አንስትያ “women-folk” are used. In like manner we have አፋኪያ “rings” (Ex. 35, 10), and አርማያ “Heathen” (from አርማይ = አረማዊ) Rom. 10, 12 (old ed.).

While a Proper name is held to be indeclinable, it may be raised to the Plural in outward form also by prefixing አለ = “those of”:—አለ : ያርብሕ “giants” Gen. 6, 4; 14, 5, although ያርብሕ may be put in the Acc. ያርብሐ, Gen. 10, 8. So too አለ : ሰባዕቱ “the Seven” (LUDOLF, ‘*Lex.*’).

(c) *Plurals of Plurals.*

Plurals
of
Plurals.

§ 141. Besides the power of forming the Collectives which have been described, Ethiopic possesses a peculiar aptitude for deriving, from Collectives produced by inner formation, new Plurals by means of outer, and in fact feminine, Plural-endings. Of such aptitude it has made so extensive a use, as to be in this matter unapproached by any other Semitic speech⁽²⁾. Every Collective, in fine, is capable of being regarded as a single compact notion; and when such a notion has to be marked as presenting itself in multiplex form, a new Plural of the same may readily be fashioned. A language, endowed with such an aptitude, enjoys a peculiar brevity in expression, and is enabled to render in a single word notions which in other tongues stand in need of several words for their description. The possible applications of this faculty are, however, manifold.

1. Several words in the Plural express only one single notion,

⁽¹⁾ Cf. EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 323.

⁽²⁾ On the Arabic cf. EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 326.

and therefore admit of a new Plural in the sense of a number of these being present. To this class belong the conceptions brought forward in § 131, 2: **አምላክ** “God”, **አምሳል** “image”, **አምጣን** “measure”, **ኦርያም** “heaven”, **አማዑስ** “bowels”, **አቅላም** “writing-appliances”, **መቃብር** “grave”, **ተኣምር** “sign”, **መዓርግ** “ladder” (from **ማዕርግ** “step”) &c.; and accordingly we have the Plurals:—**አማልክት** “Gods”, (*cf. infra* 5), **አምሳላት**, **አምጣናት**, **ኦርያማት**, **አማዑሳት**, **አቅላማት**, **መቃብራት** (Matt. 27, 52 & 53), **ተኣምራት**, **መዓርጎች**. So also **ዕፀዎች** “groves of trees”, Deut. 28, 40, 42; and from **ዐጸድ** “court”, **አዕጸድ** “farm-yards” and **አዕጸዳት** “several farm-yards” Josh. 16, 7 &c.

2. In particular the Names of rivers, lakes, mountains, roads, localities, circles, doors, instruments, times, months, countries, and nations,—may, with reference to the parts, of which they consist, stand in the first Plural but with the force of an ordinary Sing.; they then easily admit of a second Plur., often where the simple Plur. might have been expected: **አፍላግ** and **አፍላጎች** “rivers”, **አዕያግ** and **አዕያጎች** “lakes” (Lev. 11, 36), **አድባር** and **አድባራት** “range of mountains”, **ፍናው** and **ፍናዎች** “ways”, “roads”, **አዕዋድ** and **አዕዋዳት** “seats at an assembly” (“circles”) Matt. 23, 6.—Also **አጽዋን** and **አጽዋናት** “fortifications”, **አውጸብ** and **አውጸባት** “ear-rings”, **አውቃፍ** and **አውቃፋት** “bracelets”, **መዓጽው** and **መዓጽዎች** “doors” (inasmuch as a door itself frequently consists of several parts), **ጸናጽል** and **ጸናጽላት** “cymbals”, **መሰናቁት** and **መሰናቁታት** “citharas”, **መኃትው** and **መኃትዎች** “lamps”, **አዝማን** and **አዝማናት** “times”, **አውራጎ** and **አውራጎች** “months”, **አንጋድ** and **አንጋዳት** “tribes”, **አህጉር** and **አህጉራት** “cities”. In many cases in which those second Plurals are employed, the underlying idea is, “in their various kinds”, *e. g.* **አዝማናት** “times”, in their various kinds, such as—“seasons of the year, years, months &c.”; **አውቃፋት** Hen. 8, 1 “rings of every sort”, &c.

3. Every Collective may be raised to the second Plural,—with or without the accompaniment of **ብዙኅ** “much”, “many”, or **ሁሉ** “all”—, for the purpose of expressing Multiplicity, Multitude or Universality. Thus:—**አልሀምታት** : **ሁሉሙ** ⁽¹⁾ “all oxen”

(1) [FLEMMING reads in Hen. 87, 4 **ወሁሉሙ**; in 70, 3 **አሕባለ**; and **መባዕልት** in 53, 3. 4. TR.]

(Hen. 87, 4), **ኩሉ፡ አሕቃላት** “all the districts”, Gen. 13, 10; **ኩሎን፡ አኅማላት** “all herbs together”, Mark 4, 32; **አሥቃቃት** “all the coverings of hair”, Numb. 4, 25; **አዕዋፋት** “all birds”, Gen. 8, 19; **አጽባኣት** “all wars”; **አእናፋት** “the nostrils of all the people”, Numb. 11, 20; **አንቅዕታት** “every fountain” (Hen. 89, 3); or **አእላፈ፡ አእላፋት** “myriads of myriad-masses” (‘hundreds of millions’).

4. If the Plural of an idea is already assignable to a single individual, the Plural of that Plural is formed, whenever it falls to be ascribed to several individuals. Thus, for example, a single man has **አማዑት** “bowels”, but several men have **አማዕዋት**. Hen. 70, 3 reads: ‘The angels took **አሕባላት**⁽¹⁾ “cords”’, because each took **አሕባለ** (although in the corresponding passage 61, 1, only **አሕባል** appears). For the same reason exactly, **መባላት**⁽¹⁾ “tools” appears in Hen. 53, 3, 4. One “code of laws” is **መጽሐፈ፡ ሕግግ**, but “codes of laws” can be expressed by **መጽሕፍተ፡ ሕገ ጋት**. Thus one may say **ዘበጸውዕ** (‘a man of enchantments’) “a wonder-worker”, “conjuror”, but in the Plural **እለ፡ በጸውዓት** quite as well as **እለ፡ በጸውዕ**.

5. A distinction must be drawn between the cases which have been named, and cases like the following; when, for instance, **ሊቃን** “principals” and **ነገሥት** “kings” enter upon a second Plural for the purpose merely of denoting the dignity still more specially, as in **ሊቃናት** and **ሊቃውንት**, **ነገሥታት**; or when external Plural-endings, either masculine or feminine, are annexed to a Collective-form of a Personal-word, simply to distinguish the gender more definitely. Thus if one means to use with more precision the word **መዓስብ** (from **ማዕስብ**) *i. e.* “widowers” or “widows”, he says **መዓስባን** “widowers”, and **መዓስባት** “widows”; and so too **መዓቅባን** “watchmen”. The termination *āt* is also appended to **አዋልድ** “daughters”, making **አዋልዳት**, to indicate the gender more exactly.

The formation of this second Plural is effected regularly by appending the termination *āt* (seldom *ān*), and is therefore an *outer* form; it is only in the case of **አምላክ** and **ሊቃን** that the new Plural takes the *inner* form⁽²⁾. The ending *āt* is also com-

(1) [See Note on p. 315. TR.]

(2) Irregular forms, influenced by Amharic are found in **መረዋሕት**, **መረዋውሕት**; **መጽዋዕት**, **መጽዋውዕት**.

monly applied externally to Collective Stems which end in the Fem. ት:—አላህምት, አላህምታት; but when the Collective Stem ends in *ūt*, the form *wāt* is preferred to *ūtāt*, although the former is not absolutely binding (§ 133, *b, α*):—አማዑት, አማዕዋት; መፃፂት, መፃፃዋት⁽¹⁾.

III. FORMATION OF CASES.

§ 142. The various relations, upon which a Noun may enter in the course of a sentence, — commonly called *Cases* —, are represented in Ethiopic, just as in Semitic languages generally, only by a small number of special formations. A noun takes its place in a sentence, either without being dependent, — in other words as Subject, — or as dependent, whether on a Verb as Object, or on another noun as a Genitive. On these three leading positions, assumable by a Noun in the sentence, rest the Cases which are possible in Semitic languages generally, and which in Arabic, — the most perfect of these languages in this respect, — have received the impress of special Forms. These Cases are: the *Nominative*, — which may also be regarded as including a second species of the independent Noun, viz. the Noun when used in address, or the *Vocative*; the *Accusative*; and the *Genitive*. All those farther relations of a Noun in the Sentence, which are indicated in other languages by various other Case-forms, must in the Semitic tongue be either expressed with the help of Prepositions, — in particular the Dative by means of the Preposition ለ (§ 164), — or made up for by a wider application of the relational powers inherent in the Accusative and Genitive. But even these four Cases, which alone are possible in Semitic, have been by no means completely developed in all Semitic languages; and in Ethiopic some of these Cases have received only a partial development⁽²⁾.

1. The
Nominative
and
Vocative.

1. The *Nominative*, as the Subject-Case, has by way of antithesis the Accusative as the Object-Case. As Subject-Case it

⁽¹⁾ A remarkable form is the irregular አኅመልማላት (LUDOLF, 'Lex.' col. 274) which LUDOLF derives from ኅመልማል. [V. also, on a few Plur.-Plur. Forms not yet registered in the Lexicon, *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XVIII.]

⁽²⁾ In ZDMG XXXIV, p. 758 HAUPT very properly opposes the view put forward by HOMMEL, — that the original Semitic had a distinction of Cases.

is without relation; while the *Casus obliquus* invariably involves a relation to some word on which it depends. Originally the unrelated Case was not denoted in Semitic languages by any special form⁽¹⁾; but the pure Nominal Stem, affected only by gender and number, was able to take its place in a sentence at once, as independent word, when that was called for. Northern Semitic tongues, at least, have remained at this stage. Arabic, however, has advanced a step. As it denoted the dependent character of the Object by a termination affixed to the Nominal Stem, so it denoted also the circumstance of independence by terminations⁽²⁾. Ethiopic in this matter rather sides with the Northern Semitic. But at all events it exhibits in the greater number of Nominal Stems a different vowel-ending for the independent Case from that of the Object-Case, and thus in a certain sense shows a Nominative-ending contrasted with the Accusative-ending. In the department of the Pronouns the Personal Pronoun in the independent Case has the ending \bar{u} = "he", for the masculine gender, and \bar{i} = "she", for the Feminine. The same thing is found too in several other words, particularly in the Numerals, *e. g.* አሐዱ "one" (*m.*), አሐቲ "one" (*f.*). Now, seeing that Arabic also takes *u* as the termination of the Nominative of a Noun, and that a like phenomenon presents itself in kindred languages⁽³⁾, and that farther it is to be assumed, in accordance with phonetic laws (§ 38), that Ethiopic Nominal-Stems also ended at one time in vowels, and that some other vowel-ending must thus have existed wherever the vowel-ending of the Accusative was wanting,—we are brought to the supposition that in Ethiopic also, those Nouns which now end in the third radical, had once a vowel-ending in the independent Case. Various traces,—chiefly in the written character—, indicate that this ending was the short indeterminate *e*⁽⁴⁾. The fundamental antithesis between Subject-Case and Object-Case was thus at one time also signified in most instances by contrasted terminations. But Ethiopic seems never to have made any attempt to denote in addition, by means of different vowel-endings, the other contrast which

(1) V. EWALD, '*Hebr. Spr.*' § 202, *a.*

(2) Exactly as the relations of the verb are, or were, denoted by the kind of vowels which form the terminations.

(3) V. EWALD, '*Hebr. Spr.*' p. 450, Note 1.

(4) Otherwise BARTH, ZDMG XLVI, p. 685.

obtains between Nominative and Genitive: it was Arabic alone that took this forward step. The one termination *e* was charged in Ethiopic with signifying both the Noun in its independent condition and the Noun as depending upon another Noun. In this way any specific meaning in that *e* as a mark of the Nominative was taken from it. Besides, the entire development of vowel-expression tended to render the short *ě* more and more fugitive, and in certain circumstances to oust it altogether (§ 37 sq.); and therefore, in the end, Ethiopic completely gave up marking the Noun in a merely general way, and as a consequence the Nominative, by any vowel-ending,—while on the other hand it continued regularly to mark the Accusative. It was only in certain cases, viz. those in which the demand was enforced by syllabic structure or by the phonetic character of the last radical, that the *ě* of the Nominative-Genitive had to be more tenaciously retained, as has been pointed out in detail in § 38.

And if even the Nominative is not outwardly marked, still less is the *Vocative*, which does not present so direct an antithesis to any Case, as the Nominative does to the Accusative. The Nominal Stem, as a rule, suffices for the Noun in address. And yet Ethiopic from another side has made a start in the independent development of a *Vocative*. Just as in other languages, the *Vocative* may here also be indicated outwardly by the apposition of an interjection,—the accented (TRUMPP, p. 544) particle **አ** (§ 61), *e. g.* **አገብር: ጌር** “(O) Thou good servant!” Luke 19, 17; **አአንስትዮ** “O my wives!” Gen. 4, 23; **አትውልድ: ዕሉት** “O perverse generation!” Luke 9, 41; **አአብድ** “Thou fool!” Luke 12, 20; **አአገሌ** “O So-and-so!”. In Ethiopic a farther step has been taken, and **አ** has been appended to the Noun⁽¹⁾, and a beginning made of a true Case-form. This kind of *Vocative*-form may at one time have been more extensively used in the language, but it is now confined to a few words which are frequently employed in the *Vocative*. The aspirate then regularly falls away from **አ** (§ 47)⁽²⁾.

(1) Just as other Cases, in Semitic and other languages, have originated in the attachment of short words, chiefly from Prepositions or Pronouns.

(2) That the relation of the Construct State is not affected by this form is maintained by LUDOLF, ‘*Gr.*’ III, 7, appeal being made to Ps. 83, 1 & 4;

Thus we still frequently meet with **አግዚአ** “Lord!”, *e. g.* in Ps. 8,1; Matt. 7,21; **እሞ** (*Org.*) and **እሙ** “mother!”; **ብእሲቶ** “woman!” John 4,21; 20,13 & 15. How largely **አ** in this combination has parted with any emphatic meaning which it had⁽¹⁾, is evidenced by the fact that now and then a second **አ** is prefixed to a Votive which has been formed in this way:—**አብእሲቶ** “O woman!” John 2,4; Matt. 15,28; *cf.* PRAETORIUS, ZDMG XLVII, p. 388 *sq.*

Besides, it is only the word **አብ** “father”, which possesses a special Votive **አብ** (Gen. 27,18; 22,7; Matt. 11,25; Luke 15,18, 21 &c.),—probably an Accusative (as in the Arabic **يَا زَكَرِيَّا**), since the Accusative of **አብ**, at least before Suff. Pronouns, has still the form **አብ** (§ 154)⁽²⁾. In the large majority of cases, however, even in Ethiopic, the Votive is expressed by the pure Nominal Stem: **ገብር: እኩይ** “wicked servant!” Matt. 18,32; 25,26.

2. The
Accusative:
Usual
Marking.
When such
Marking
is not
exhibited.

§ 143. 2. *The Accusative.* Of the ancient antithetic markings of the Nominative and the Accusative, Ethiopic has retained and carried on the latter at least. In contrast to the *ě* of the Nominative-Genitive, the Accusative was denoted by a final *ă*, both in the department of the Pronouns and in that of the true Nouns. In this respect Ethiopic completely agrees with Arabic. But this *ă*, in certain cases, takes the fuller form **ሃ** *hā*; and, when everything is duly considered, there cannot remain a doubt that **ሃ** is the ground-form, of which *ă* is only a truncated remnant. This is an impersonal demonstrative particle (§ 62) with the force of “here” or “there”⁽³⁾, and in origin it is certainly identical with the Hebrew **הָ** of direction. It thus indicates primarily direction towards an object,—towards which the action is directed as being its peculiar object: **አፍቀረ: ብእሲተ** “he loves (in the direction

but in his own edition of the Psalms he has printed, not **አግዚአ: ገያላን**, but **አግዚአ: ገያላን**. [**አግዚአ: ገያላን**, however, appears in the “Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth” (ed. J. PERRUCHON, Paris 1903), p. 9, l. 1; *cf.* also PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVIII, p. 487.]

(1) [On the farther development of this ending *ō*, *cf.* NÖLDEKE, ‘*Beitr. z. Semit. Spr.*’, p. 72 and Note 3.]

(2) *Cf.*, besides, **ጸጌጸ** [and NÖLDEKE, l. c. p. 71.]

(3) Of like meaning are the similarly enclitic **ሂ**, and the affixes **ኔ** and **ነ** (§ 160) derived from another demonstrative root; the Amharic Accusative-sign *en* proceeds from **ነ**.

of) a woman". And this explains at once not only the appropriateness of such marking to indicate the subordination of an Object to a transitive verb, but also the peculiar use of the Accusative (in Semitic generally, and therefore in Ethiopic) for relations, which in other languages are expressed by other Cases. The Accusative is employed here, like the Locative in Sanskrit, in space-reference to express continuance in a place or motion towards a place, in time-reference to reply to the question 'When?' or 'How long?', and in fine to indicate any reference whatever in a statement, *e. g.* ተገልበት፡ገጸ "she was veiled,—as to her face" (v. § 174 *sqq.*). These various meanings of the Accusative are fully explained by the fundamental signification of the particle ሃ. The following details regarding the Accusative-formation fall to be noticed.

The original form of the Affix ሃ, which invariably takes the accent (TRUMPP, p. 544), still appears in Proper names pretty regularly. To be sure it is not absolutely necessary for a Proper name to take the sign of the Accusative, in order to be turned into that Case, for, precisely as being a Proper Name, it is accounted fixed and indeclinable and never enters upon the Construct State, and is thus enabled to dispense with the sign of the Accusative. Indeed in the majority of cases occurring in existing Manuscripts, the Accusative-marking of Proper Names is wanting, especially when the Accusative is easily recognised as such from the context, *e. g.* Josh. 22,23; 24,4. But when a sign does make its appearance, it is always *hā* (never *a*)⁽¹⁾, because it is not so closely knit to the Stem as is the form *a*, but is more externally attached, and also because it does not alter the ground-form of a Name which ends in a vowel. Above all, in the case of Compound Names,—which are very common in Ethiopic,—this more external attachment of the sign is altogether necessary. Thus: ይሁዳሃ "Judah" (*Acc.*) Matt. 1, 2; ዘርአ፡ማርያምሃ; እግዚአብሔርሃ; ደብረ፡ዘይትሃ. For numerous instances of Proper Names in the Accusative, with and without ሃ, v. Matt. 1, Gen. 4. This ሃ, so applied, denotes farther all the relations which are otherwise expressed by the Accusative, *e. g.* ቤተ፡ልሔምሃ "to Bethlehem" Matt. 2, 8; but they may also be conveyed without ሃ, *e. g.* ወበዊአ፡ቅፍርናሆም "and when he came

(⁶) [And yet *a* seems to occur in the *Kebra Nag.*, p. 12 (Note 14). where in four MSS. the *Acc.* of ሀንድ "India" is given as ሀንድ.]

to Capernaum" Matt. 8, 5. **ሃ** is frequently met with in poetry, attached to words even which have the **ላ** of direction prefixed to them: **ሰላም : አብል : ለኤርምላዎስሃ : ቀሲስ** (LUDOLF, *Gr.*).—But even in appellative Nouns this **ሃ** appears, although very rarely, instead of the usual *a*, e. g. **ኀልሃ** "the cave" (Epist. Zar'a-Jacob, in LUDOLF's *Comm.*); cf. also **አገሌሃ**. Moreover it is still preserved as *ā* (without the breathing) in a few words used adverbially, § 163.

The sign of the Accusative is usually attached to appellative Nouns (Substantives, Adjectives, Infinitives) as an unaccented *ä*⁽¹⁾ (cf. TRUMPP, p. 544 sq.), both in Singular and Plural forms. When the word ends in a consonant, after parting with the *ě* of the Nom.-Gen., *a* is simply annexed: **ንጉሥ** "king", **ንጉሠ**, Plur. **ነገሥተ**; so with **አብ** "father" (Matt. 3, 9; 15, 4); **ዕንቁ** "precious stone", **ዕንቁ**; **እኑ** "brother", **እኑ**, Gen. 43, 6 & 7, or **እኅወ** Gen. 24, 29. Words which have *ā* in the last syllable, lengthened by the influence of an Aspirate, retain this *ā* in the Accusative, e. g. **ኅጣእ** "want", Acc. **ኅጣእ**. But when the Stem ends in a vowel, a distinction has to be made between *ē*, *ō*, *ā* on the one hand and *ī*, *ū* on the other. With *ē*, *ō*, *ā* the Accusative sign does not combine in the form **ሃ** as might have been expected, but *ä* blends with these vowels into *ē*, *ō*, *ā*, whatever their origin may have been (§ 39). Forms like **ዕንዚራ** "cithara", **ጽጌ** "flower", **አርቄ** "beast", **ሐራ** "army", **ሀብ** "dew", **ግልፍ** "carved work" are the same in the Accusative as in the Nominative; and possible ambiguities may have to be avoided by a periphrasis of the Accusative with the help of a Suff. Pron. and a following **ላ** (§ 172). There are no Nominal Stems ending in *ū*. When *ū* does occur, e. g. in **ኩሉ** "all", or in **አሐዱ** "one" (*m.*), it is of Pronominal origin; and these words accordingly form their Accusative after the manner of Pronouns (§ 157 sq.). Of words ending in *ī*, those in which *ī* is a Suffix Pron., like **አሐቲ** "one (*f.*)", also fall under the rules of the Pronouns (§ 158). But, over and above, there are many other Stems which end in a radical *ī* (e. g. **መፍሪ** "fruitful"), or in a formative *ī* (e. g. **ጠሊ** "goat" for **ጠሊይ**), or in the Adjective-ending *ī*: It is the rule for these not to harden the *ī* into *y*, but to turn the *i-a* of the Acc. into its equivalent *ē*, in accordance

(1) There is a special reason for the length of the *ā* in the Accusatives of several words, before Suffix Pronouns (§ 154).

with § 40: **ብእሱ**. “man” takes the form **ብእሱ**; **ደብረ** : **ወረቃዊ** Gen. 10, 30; **ሐረሳዊ** : **ብእሱ** Gen. 49, 15. **ጠሊ** also forms **ጠሌ**; and only in cases in which *i* alternates still with *ey*^e (§ 51), as in **መፍርይ** and **መፍሪ**, **መከልይ** and **መከሊ**, **ባሕርይ** and **ባሕሪ**, is the Accusative-form **መፍርየ**, **መከልየ**, **ባሕርየ** the usual one, although the other is not impossible.

Alongside of this, the usual Accusative-form with the majority of Nominal Stems, cases occur, in which the form is abandoned, or is not exhibited. The discussion of these cases properly belongs to the Syntax, but still it seems more to the purpose to bring them together at this stage. 1. When the Accusative-construction is continued through several members of a sentence, it is now and then parted with in the later members, after the Accusative has been indicated in the first member of the series, or in the opening members, *e. g.* Numb. 19, 16; Hen. 22, 1⁽¹⁾,—or in the case of a word which is set in apposition to the Accusative, as in Ex. 31, 18⁽²⁾. 2. When the Accusative is definitely determined by means of a word introduced by **ዘ**, whether this be a mark of the Genitive, or the Relative, the form of the Accusative-relation may on that account be renounced, *e. g.* Ex. 35, 22 (F. H.) **አውቃፈ** : **ወኑሉ** : **ሰርጉ** : **ዘወርቅ** (for **ወኑሉ** : **ሰርጉ**); Numb. 8, 8 **ይነሥኡ** : **ላህም** : **ዘዓመት** (for **ላህመ**); Numb. 19, 10 & 21 **ይኩን** : **ሕግ** : **ዘለዓለም** (for **ሕግ**, *e. g.* Gen. 17, 7)⁽³⁾. This is explained by the Attraction of the Noun, —very common in Ethiopic—, effected by the Relative pronoun; and if **ዘ** as Genitive-sign exercises the same influence, this is simply the result of the very lively consciousness, possessed by the language, of the original relative-force of the Genitive-sign⁽⁴⁾. 3. Finally, when Suffix Pronouns are attached to the Accusative, the Accusative-marking, in certain cases, gets lost. The same thing occurs when an Accusative is found in the construct state (§ 144).

(¹) [FLEMMING's reading here has the Acc.-construction throughout. TR.]

(²) On the phrase **ዕለት** : **እምዕለት** or **እምዕለት** : **ዕለት** v. DILLMANN'S 'Lex.' col. 925; *cf.* also **ሀገር** : **እምሀገር** Sir. 36, 31.

(³) *Cf.* also *Chrest.* p. 52, line 5; PLATT, *Didasc.* 43, 9 &c. (KÖNIG, p. 70); also LUDOLF, 'Gr.' VI, 2, 13.

(⁴) On the other hand it is not to be considered a case in point, that after **ከመ** “like” or “as”, the Acc. can never stand,—a circumstance which LUDOLF found so very remarkable (*e. g.* Ps. 37, 21; Cant. 8, 6); for **ከመ** is a Prep. and always stands in the Constr. St. with reference to what follows.

3. The
Genitive
Relation:—
(a) The
Construct
State.

§ 144. 3. To express the third of the possible relations, viz. the *Genitive relation*, or,—to use more general language—, the relation of subordination of one noun to another, Ethiopic makes use of that device which of old has been the common property of all Semitic tongues,—the so-called *Construct State*. Although this Construct State does correspond in many cases to the Genitive relation of other languages, it is capable of a much wider and more multiform signification. It may indicate every possible form of subordination of one noun to another, denoted in Non-Semitic languages by means of Prepositions or Compounds. But besides the Construct State, Ethiopic makes use of still other expedients, to indicate the Genitive relation, in the narrower sense of the expression.

(a) *The Construct State*. The oldest Semitic has a device for subordinating one Noun to another, which is not unknown even to the Indo-European tongues. It is a kind of combination or apposition of words, in which the more general idea, requiring to be more precisely determined, is placed before a special and determining idea, associating itself therewith and subordinating it. The meaning and force of this condition lie just in the close association of the two words, and in the emphatic accent assumed by the subordinate word as being the determining element, just as if our own words 'Landlord', 'Householder' were written 'Lord-Lând', 'Holder-Hôuse', meaning 'Lord of the land', 'Holder of the house'. North-Semitic farther shows that by merely uttering the two words more closely together, and at the same time accentuating the last, and thereby of course pronouncing the first as short as possible, this relation is established. But a relative particle may also be inserted between the two words, expressly announcing the relativity which obtains between the two. This is the variety of the Construct State formation which appears in Old Hebrew,—in the so called 'binding vowel' of the Constr. St., and it is this variety which has become the predominating one in Ethiopic. But the particle of relativity is not prefixed to the second (or determining) word,—as in Amharic,—nor affixed thereto,—as in Arabic,—by which latter proceeding the second word would be reduced to an ordinary Genitive, and the necessity perhaps removed for placing the two words together at all. The particle is, on the contrary, attached to the first word,—the word which is to be determined—,

and marks it as having a relation to a second and immediately following word, so that the arrangement of the two words, in the order of succession thus marked, continues to be an absolutely necessary one. This particle then, which is appended like a termination to the subordinating word, in the case of such a pair,—that is to say, the Ending of the Construct State—, in Ethiopic is invariably *a*. Now such a termination coincides externally with the termination of the Accusative, but it is self-evident that it cannot be originally identical therewith, as it expresses something entirely different, and is appended, not to what is subordinated, but to what subordinates. Before Pronouns, which are subordinated as Suffixes to a Construct State, this Ending takes the form of *ī* (§ 153) and in several cases the still fuller form of *īa* (§ 150). And when it is farther considered that even in Hebrew an *ī* appears as the binding-vowel of the Constr. St., and that Amharic expresses the Genitive by prefixing the relative particle **የ** (corresponding to the Ethiopic **ዘ**),—the inference is unhesitatingly drawn, that the termination *a* is merely an abbreviation of the fuller *ia*, and that *ia* itself means nothing other than “the—of” or “who”, “which” and is developed from an original *i*, just as is **ዘ** from **ዝ** (§ 65). For example, **የገንዘብ ስጋ** means originally: “doors which—house”, “doors relating to—house”, “doors of a house” or “house-doors”⁽¹⁾. But the termination *ia* did not become *ē*,—as it might have done, according to Ethiopic phonetic rules,—for there was no need to establish a long vowel dwelling on the Tone between the two closely united words, but as a rule it was curtailed into the shorter *ā*. In many cases, however, as we shall see, *ē* has been maintained (§ 167), but in those cases it is perhaps of a different origin.

An Ethiopic word then, whether Sing. or Plur., is put in the Constr. St. by attaching to it the unaccented (TRUMPP, p. 544) termination *a*. Accordingly when such a word enters upon the Constr. St., its termination is undistinguishable from that of the Accusative,

⁽¹⁾ TRUMPP adheres to the above explanation of the termination *a* (pp. 544, N. 1; 557, N. 1): v. on the other hand HALÉVY, ‘*Journ. as.*’ VII, 1, p. 453 sqq.; and PRAETORIUS ZDMG XXVI, p. 433; XXVII, p. 643. PRAETORIUS seems to be right in emphasising (*Amh. Spr.*, p. 126) the fact that the Amharic **የ** cited by us is itself only a weakened form (through **ዝ**) of **ዘ**.

e. g. **ፈነወ፡ ጸሐፍተ፡ ሕዝብ** “he sent the learned men of the nation”. The rules for attaching it are the same as for the *a* of the Accusative (§ 143). To words ending in a consonant *a* is simply annexed: *e. g.* **መንግሥተ፡ ሰማያት** “kingdom of heaven” (from **መንግሥት**); **ጸሐፍተ፡ ሕዝብ** “the learned men of the nation” (from **ጸሐፍት**); **አበ፡ ደም** “avenger of blood” (from **አብ** “father”) ⁽¹⁾. It is to be noticed that words ending in an Aspirate and having *ā* in the last syllable retain this *ā* in the Constr. St., as **ኅጣእ**, **ኅጣእ**; **ላዕላዕ**, **ላዕላዕ**. In the case of words which end in *ā*, *ē*, *ō*, *a* disappears in these vowels: **እንስሳ፡ ገዳም** “beasts of the field”, **ትክቶ፡ አንስት** “course of a woman”, **ጊዜ፡ ሣልስ፡ ሰዓት** “time of the third hour”. Words in *ū*, like **ዮሉ**, **አሐዱ**, do not admit of any Constr. St. at all (§ 157). With words in *ī*, *a* blends with *ī* into *ē*, following the rules given in § 143:—**ብእሴ**, “man” forms **ብእሴ**; **ገባሪ**, **ገባሪ**; **ሐቤ፡ ምእት** “centurion” (*lit.* ‘prefect, ሐቢ, of a hundred’) Matt. 8, 5: but **መስተስሪ** has **መስተስርዩ**, and in like manner **ማሪ** “seer” has **ማርዩ**. Alongside of these, **ማሪ** and the like are also possible at least, although on the other hand, in the most ancient times, such a form even as **ብእስዩ** seems to have been in use ⁽²⁾. There is no Constr. St. from Proper names.—On the significations of this Constr. St. relation, see § 184.

Periphrastic
Indication
of the
Genitive
by
Prefixing
Rel. Pron.
to
Determin-
ing Word.

§ 145. (*b*) *Periphrastic indication of the Genitive.* The expression of the Genitive by means of the Constr. St. always demands that the two words,—the word to be determined and the determining one,—be ranked immediately together: no third, extraneous word, as for instance an adjective, can ever come between the two ⁽³⁾; for otherwise the ordered combination, which is the very condition of the Constr. St.-relation, would be destroyed. In this way the language was much hampered in the arrangement of its words. Besides, there are many words, such as Proper names, which do not admit of any Constr. St.; and there are others, like those which end in *ā*, *ē*, *ō*, which present no difference in form whether they are in the Constr. St. or in the Absolute St. Finally, the marking of the Accusative cannot be distinguished from that of the Constr. St., in those cases in which the word to be put in

⁽¹⁾ It is not accurate for LUDOLF to say that **አብ**, **እኅ**, **ሐም**, **አፍ** must indicate the Constr. St. circuitously by means of Suff. Pron. and **ሉ**.

⁽²⁾ V. the ‘RÜPPELL Inscriptions’, I, 1; II, 2. ⁽³⁾ [V. Note to § 185. TR.]

the Constr. St. enters at the same time upon the Accusative. Accordingly it is not to be wondered at, that this, the oldest method of denoting the Genitive relation, was found insufficient for the language, and that a new method was contrived, conducing to clearness of expression and freedom in the arrangement of words. This new denotation rests, it is true, upon the method of indicating the Genitive relation found in the Ethiopic Construct State. Just as in that case, recourse here is had to a Relative Pronoun to indicate the relativity of the situation. But there is this great difference between the old and the new method, that in the latter there is no necessary apposition of the words, and that accordingly the Relative Pron. is not affixed to the word which has to be determined or limited, but is prefixed to the determining one. The Relative Pron. which is employed for this purpose is not the more ancient **የ** ⁽¹⁾, but the form which in later times became the common one, viz. **ዘ** ⁽²⁾,—a circumstance which is itself a proof that the whole of this mode of marking is of secondary origin. The force of this Genitive-marking cannot be attended with any doubt: **አክሊል : ዘወርቅ** is “crown-which-gold” or “crown-related to-gold”, that is “crown of gold” or “golden crown”; **እግዚእ : ዘቤተ** “lord-relative to-house”, “lord of the house”. The position taken in the sentence by a Genitive formed in this way is completely unfettered. The expression may run **ዘወርቅ : አክሊል** quite as well as **አክሊል : ዘወርቅ**, or **አክሊል : ዐቢይ : ዘወርቅ**. But the vigorous life, which the original relative meaning of this Genitive sign still exhibits in the language, is witnessed to, not only by the proof incidentally brought forward towards the close of § 143, but by the circumstance that this sign may, just like the Relative Pron., assume the distinctions of Gender and Number. True, it is allowed and is by far the most usual practice, to denote the Genitive by **ዘ** merely, even when the Noun on which it depends is feminine or stands in the Plural, *e. g.* **ቤተ : ልሔም : ዘይሁዳ** “Bethlehem in Judah” Matt. 2, 1, or **አባግዕ :**

(1) Which is still retained in Amharic for this purpose.

(2) Ethiopic in this usage agrees wholly with Aramaic, which employs **ܐܝܢ**, **ܐܝܢܐ** for this purpose. HALÉVY farther compares **ܐܝܢܐ**; v. MORDTMANN, ZDMG XLIV, p. 191 sq.—**ዘ** is prefixed to the word, which it has to put in the Genitive, invariably without ‘separating points’ (§ 147).

ዘተሐጉለ : ዘቤተ : እስራኤል “the lost sheep of the house of Israel” Matt. 15, 24; but when the governing word is feminine, the feminine form **እንተ** at least may take the place of **ዘ**, *e. g.* **ማርያ : እንተ : ያዕቆብ** “*Maria Jacobi*” Matt. 27, 56; **ዐይንክ : እንተ : የማን** “thine eye of the right side” (“thy right eye”) Matt. 5, 29; **አንቀጽ : እንተ : እግዚአብሔር** “the gate of the Lord” Ps. 117, 19; and when the governing word is in the Plural, the Plural Genitive-sign **እለ** may be used: **አልሀምት : እለ : ውእቱ : ዐጸድ** “the oxen of that farm” Hen. 89, 5; **አድባረ : ቆባራት : እለ : ክረምት** “the mountains of the murkinesses of Winter” Hen. 17, 7.

This denotation of the Genitive by means of **ዘ** has so completely gained the upper hand, that it has pretty much pushed aside another method which is possible, and which is in very frequent use in Hebrew, that namely which employs the preposition **ለ** (ከ), *v.* § 186.

On another possible method of indicating the Genitive, by means of a Pron. Suff. with following **ለ**, *v.* § 172.

B. PRONOUNS AND NUMERALS.

I. PRONOUNS.

I. Pronouns: § 146. Many peculiarities have been admitted and retained in the formation of the persons, numbers, genders and cases of
—1. Demonstrative Pronouns. Pronouns, which have never found admittance with Nominal Stems derived from Conceptional roots.

1. *Demonstrative words developed into Personal Demonstratives (Pronomina Demonstrativa).*

(a) The Demonstrative word, readiest to hand, is **ዝ** “this” (*m.*), § 62, pronounced *zé* with a short, sharp utterance, and always accentuated (TRUMPP, p. 546). In its first form (Nom.-Gen.) it ends, like other Nominal Stems, in the short, indeterminate *e*. It forms its Fem. with the feminine ending *ā* (§ 126) **ዝ** “this” (*f.*), and the Accusative with the usual Accusative-ending *ǎ* (§ 143): thus the Acc. masc. is **ዝ** “this” (*acc. m.*), *e. g.* Ex. 20, 1, and the Acc. fem. **ዝ** “this” (*acc. f.*), *e. g.* Matt. 17, 9. This pronoun is still used pretty often in the Nominative, but not so often in the Accusative. As the particle is a very short one, it usually rests against the preceding or succeeding word, *e. g.* **ዝእኩዝ** Matt. 15, 8; **ኢይትከህልዝ** Matt. 19, 26; **ዝተሉ** 13, 54; **ለዝ** 8, 9; **ዝሰ** 27, 47; **ዝኑ**

Gen. 43, 29; **ምስለዛ** : **ትውልድ** Matt. 12, 41; **ዛትውልድ** 24, 34; **ዛኒ** 26, 13; **ወዝኮነ** 21, 4. Only very seldom is it separated from the following word by : as an independent word, as in Gen. 42, 28.

Precisely on account of its shortness the unsatisfactory form of this word made itself felt in the language even in early times, and it was therefore combined with another demonstrative,—with **ተ** (§ 62), originally akin to **ዝ**; and as **ተ** is attached at the end of the combination, it takes the signs of gender and case. It adopts the vowel *ū* in the Nom. Masc., and in the Fem. *ī* (§ 65) = “he”, “she”: **ቱ** “this” (*m.*), **ቲ** “this” (*f.*)⁽¹⁾. Instead of this *ū* and *ī*, *ä* appears always in the Accusative of both genders, thus **ተ** “this” (*acc. m. & f.*). The compound in the Fem. is simply **ዛቲ** “this” (*Nom.*), **ዛተ** “this” (*Acc.*), *e. g.* Ruth 3, 13. But in the Masc. instead of **ዝቱ**, **ዘተ**, the form becomes (§ 58) **ዝንቱ** *zéntū*⁽²⁾ (*Nom.*), **ዘንተ** *zánta* (*Acc.*). Both elements of the compound are inflected. This longer form **ዝንቱ**, **ዛቲ**, **ዘንተ**, **ዛተ** is much more frequently used than the other.

The plural of **ዝ**, **ዛ** is formed from another Demonstrative root, as happens too in the rest of the Semitic tongues, viz. *al*, *la* (§ 62), and in fact by the combination of these two forms,—so that in this way the notion of plurality is conveyed by “*the* (Sing.) + *the* (Sing.)” = “*the* (Plur.)”, “these”. The rendering in Ethiopic is Masc. **እሉ**⁽³⁾, Fem. **እላ** (*ellū*, *ellā*),—forms which probably have been curtailed from longer forms *ellūm*, *ellōm* and *ellān* (*v. infra*). Both are used with considerable frequency. **እሉ** in particular is very often used, *e. g.* Matt. 15, 20 & 32; but **እላ** occurs too, *e. g.* Matt. 5, 19; Ps. 89, 11; Hen. 22, 3; 71, 12. They have been too closely pruned towards the end, to be any longer capable of a special Acc.-form, and they are accordingly used very seldom indeed in the Accusative (*e. g.* **እሉ** Hen. 37, 3). The Accusative is either indicated by Suffix Pronouns and **ሉ**, or is expressed by means of the Compound form. The Fem. **እሎን** is met with as well as **እላ**, *e. g.* *G. Lal.* p. 55, line 20; p. 56, lines 4 & 19; p. 59, line 23.

(1) I am unable to agree with the explanation of this **ቲ** given by KÖNIG, p. 124. [*Cf.* now BROCKELMANN, ZDMG LVIII, p. 521; FISCHER, *ibid.*, p. 871 sq.; and BARTH ZDMG LIX, p. 161 sq.]

(2) This is also LUDOLF's accentuation; but see TRUMPP, p. 546.

(3) Corresponding most nearly to the Rabbinical **אלה**.

Now just as the Singular **ዝ**, **ዛ** is generally strengthened by the addition of **ቱ**, so also is the Plural, by the application of **ቱ** to the original forms, **እሉ** and **እላ**:—**እሎንቱ**, more rarely **እሉንቱ** “these” (*m.*), **እላንቱ**, more rarely **እላንቲ** “these” (*f.*)⁽¹⁾. It is remarkable in this compound that the second member indicates no distinction either of number or gender, manifestly because, if the element **ቱ** were also to form a plural (**ቶሙ**, **ቶን**, § 148), the Stem would become too long; **ቱ** in this case on the contrary abides in the Sing., and that with both genders, having the force of a strengthening “there”: as it were “these *there*”. In the Accusative, inflection does not appear in the elements **እሎን**, **እላን**, which have no longer a vowel-ending in which such inflection might become audible, but in the element **ቱ**, which (*ut supra*) passes into **ተ**: **እሎንተ**, more rarely **እሉንተ** “*hos*” (Hen. 93, 2; Matt. 10, 5; 13, 53, in the last passage, accompanying a feminine noun), **እላንተ** “*has*” (Hen. 82, 1; Ruth 3, 17, *et saepe*).

In signification **ዝ**, **ዝንቱ** &c. always refers to what is at hand and well-known; and only when it is repeated, as in **ዝንቱ ፡ ለዝንቱ** “this—to that”, can it denote on its second appearance what is at a greater distance. Both Masc. and Fem. may be used impersonally (*i. e.* as neuters); but the Masc. occurs much the more frequently in such a use.

(b) In order to form a Demonstrative which should point to what is more distant or unknown, the demonstrative pronoun, just described, was combined with the root *ka*, developed personally into *kū* (§ 62). Such is the origin of the Masc. **ዝኩ** *zékū*⁽²⁾ “this there”, *i. e.* “that” (*m.*). For the Fem., however, *kū* is not combined with **ዛ** but with a feminine form **እንት** (*ént*) “this” (*f.*), derived from the root *an* (§ 62), making **እንትኩ** “that” (*f.*) (*e. g.* Hen. 85, 5), not **እንትኪ**, as **ኩ** has become rigid and admits of no distinction of gender or number. Even the differentiation of the Accusative is not common with *kū*, and when it does occur *ū* takes refuge in the

(1) **እሙንቱ**, **እማንቱ** (§ 148) correspond exactly in form. For the rest, **እሎን** appears to have come from **እሎም** (*cf.* **ወ-እቶሙ**), influenced by the following *t*.

(2) But according to TRUMPP, p. 547, *zekū*.—The particle **ሰ** is sometimes inserted between the two elements: **ዝሰኩ**; v. DILLMANN'S ‘*Lex.*’ col. 1057, line 1. [But contrast PRAETORIUS, ‘*Beitr. z. Assyr.*’ I, p. 26.]

guttural, and **h** becomes **h̄**. The Accusative Masculine has accordingly the form **𐤅𐤆** (the first member remaining uninflected), Hen. 89, 44, 51; Gen. 27, 17 (Note); and the Accusative Feminine runs **𐤅𐤆𐤓**, **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄** and **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄** (Prov. 15, 18). Seeing then that the concluding **h** has lost to some extent its susceptibility of inflection, this form of the pronoun was still farther combined, taking in, as an additional element, **𐤕** (v. *supra* under *a*). But instead of **𐤅𐤆𐤕**,—which never occurs⁽¹⁾,—a shorter, dissyllabic form was used for the Masc., viz. **𐤅𐤆𐤕** and **𐤅𐤆𐤕** (*zélkuetū* and *zélktū*) “that” (*m.*), § 36; and instead of **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕**, or in its shorter form **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕**, the form **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** (*enták^etī*) “that” (*f.*) came into use for the Fem.,—contrived by the insertion of a feminine *ā* bearing the accent of the word (Mark 11, 21; 14, 25, *et saepe*). The Accusative is regularly formed also from the strengthened Masc.-form, thus: **𐤅𐤆𐤕** and **𐤅𐤆𐤕** “that” (*m. acc.*), *e. g.* Gen. 27, 16; Lev. 1, 8; Numb. 5, 18 & 25; Josh. 21, 40. **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** as a fem. acc. for “that” has not yet been met with.

As **𐤅𐤆** has no Plural, the Plural for both genders is formed from *ella*; and from the shorter form **𐤅𐤆**, **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄** the Plural is (*m. & f.*) **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄**, while from the longer **𐤅𐤆𐤕**, **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** it is (*m. & f.*) **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** or **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕**: the fem. **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** is also met with, Josh. 4, 11. The **𐤅𐤆** in this compound has been deprived of its vowel-ending⁽²⁾; and the doubling of the **𐤕** has probably been also given up, if we must read *ēllkuetū*, *ēllketū* and not rather *ellékuetū*, *elléktū*. On the feminine use of **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄** and **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** v. for instance Matt. 25, 7, 8, 11; Hen. 9, 8. **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄** can no longer form an Accusative, but there is taken from **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** the Accusative **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕** or **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕**, *e. g.* Ex. 34, 4; Hen. 89, 60. This plural is, besides, often replaced by **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕**, **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄𐤕**.

With special reference to the signification of this word, it is to be noted that the forms **𐤅𐤆**, **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄** &c., because they are used in pointing to the unknown, are employed also in the sense of an indefinite article, like “a”, “any”, when a speaker is introducing a new subject, known to him but as yet unknown to the hearer, *e. g.* Hen. 89, 29,—or for what is undetermined and yet

(1) For the passage cited by KÖNIG, p. 53, viz. 4 Esr. 11, 25, some farther examination of the Manuscript is recommended.

(2) Like **𐤅𐤆** from **𐤅𐤆𐤓̄**.

is under a certain degree of limitation, like “the (person) concerned”, “the (point) in question”, *e. g.* Gen. 72, 3, 5. It is also used in a contemptuous sense, like *iste*, *e. g.* in Gen. 37, 19.

Neither a Demonstrative nor any other Pronoun can enter upon the Construct State. They may, however, appear as Genitives dependent upon words in the Constr. St., *e. g.* **ደመ : ዝከቱ** Gen. 9, 6 (v. § 184), but they also frequently form their Genitive externally by means of the prefix **ዘ**.

§ 147. 2. *Relative and Interrogative Pronouns.*

2. Relative
and Inter-
rogative
Pronouns.

(a) The demonstrative root **ዝ** serves as *Relative Pronoun* in Ethiopic, without any farther combination⁽¹⁾, but it differs from the **ዝ** which means “this”, by its being always pronounced with *a*, as **ዘ** “who” or “which” (*m.*); for the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 547. The corresponding Fem. does not take the form **ዘ** (for a reason to be mentioned presently) but **እንተ** “who”, “which” (*f.*), derived from the Stem *an*, which also appears in fem. form as **እንት** in **እንትኩ**, § 146, *b*. The Plural of both of these, without distinction of Gender, is **እለ** (*élla*) “who”, “which”, derived from the Compound Pron. *el-la*, which is present also in **እሉ** and **እሉኩ** (§ 146). When it is considered that these three forms end in *a*, and differ as Relatives from the corresponding Demonstrative-forms precisely by this ending, no doubt can remain that this *a* is responsible for the Relative force of these forms. Accordingly, since *a* already exists as an essential element in the Ground-form, no Accusative-form is admitted in these three words. Just as **ወርቀ** signifies both “gold” in the Accusative and “gold” also in the Acc. and Constr. St. together⁽²⁾, so **ዘ**, **እንተ** or **እለ** may be employed directly as an Accusative. These Relatives may take the Genitive by subordinating themselves to some Construct State, as in **ብእሲተ : ዘሞተ** “the wife of him who is dead”, or by having prefixed to them the external mark of the Genitive, **ዘ : —ዘዘ** “whose” (*m.*), **ዘእንተ** “whose” (*f.*), **ዘእለ** “whose” (*pl.*).—But just as in some other Semitic tongues the relative pronoun has become rigid and no longer susceptible

(¹) Like **?** in Aramaic.

(²) [This is a somewhat obscure statement of the fact that **ወርቀ** or any ordinary Accusative-form, stands not only for the Accusative, but also for the Construct State, whether that Constr. St. happen to be Nominative, Genitive, or Accusative. TR.]

of the distinctions of Gender and Number, so in Ethiopic the form **H** may be used not only for the Masc. Sing., but also for the Fem. Sing. and for the Masc. and Fem. Plural; and this use of **H**, as a general Relative-sign, is almost as common as the differentiation of Gender and Number, *e. g.* **አበው : ዘተጋብኡ : በኒቅያ** “the fathers who assembled in Nicaea”; **እላንቱ : ዘኅርዩ** “*hae quas elegerunt*”. This is particularly the usage, when the notion, referred to by the Relative Pron., is expressly set forth in the relative sentence itself by means of a Noun or a Suff. Pron. [the Arabic **عائد**], and when accordingly a general Relative-sign is all that is needed at the beginning of the sentence, *e. g.* **ዘሞተት : ብእሲት** “*quae mortua est femina*”, or **ዘእምኔሃ** “*ex qua*”, **ዘእምኔሆሙ** “*ex quibus*”. But of course **እንተ** and **እለ** can never be employed as general Relative-signs⁽¹⁾.

If the impersonal “that which” or “what” has to be expressed, **H** is usually employed for that purpose, not **እንተ**, *e. g.* **ዘይት ሐወስ** “that which moves” (Gen. 1, 24); **ዘየሐውር** “that which goes” (Ps. 8, 8). The correlative notion, “he” (“he, who”), is included,—as in all Semitic languages,—in relatives like **H**, **እንተ** and **እለ**, whether these be in the Nom., Gen. or Acc. (v. § 201); but the notion may be farther and specially brought out, if any emphasis attaches to it, by means of **ውእቱ** or some Dem. pron., *e. g.* in **ውእቱ : ዘመጽአ** “he, to wit, who has come”. Farther **H** may express the notion contained in *quicumque*, “whosoever”, *e. g.* Matt. 10, 11, 14 (v. § 201), or it is doubled,—at least in the form **H** (though scarcely in the forms **እንተ** and **እለ**), in order to gain this meaning, thus:—**ዘዘ** “who—who”=“whosoever”. The short particle **H**, like **ዝ** (§ 146), almost always rests against another word,—on rare occasions against a word that precedes it (a preposition), but usually against the word which comes next after it in the Relative sentence which it introduces.

(b) *The Interrogative as Substantive* is **መኑ**-(²) “Who?”, compounded out of the Interrogative root *ma* (§ 62) and the Demonstrative root *na* (§ 62), which, by means of an appended *ū*,

(1) In the sentence quoted by LUDOLF,—**እግዚአብሔር : እንተ : ታፈቅር : ጽድቅ**, **እንተ** does not stand for **H** as relating to God, but is a Conjunction=**እንዘ**, thus, “*Deus justitiae amans*”.

(2) On the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 547 sq.

has a personal turn given it, in the form of *nū* (like *tū*, *kū*, § 146). It is always used personally and substantively, exactly like our "Who?", *e. g.* **እመኩ** "From whom?" (Chrest., p. 97, line 11), and it is employed farther as a rigid form, alike for the Fem. Sing. and for the Masc. and Fem. Plur., *e. g.* **መኩ : ይአቲ : ዛቲ** "Who is this (*f.*)?" (Org.); **መኩ : አንትመ** "Who are ye?" (Ex. 10, 8); **መኩ : ውእቶመ : እሉ** "Who are these?" (Hen. 40, 8); and only occasionally is it expressly put into the Plur. by prefixing **እለ** (in accordance with § 140 *ad fin.*): **እለ : መኩ : እመንቱ : አኅውዩ** "Who are my brethren?" Matt. 12, 48; Hebr. 3, 16. But **መኩ**, like other pronouns ending in *ū*, may form an Accusative: **መኒ** "Whom?" (*e. g.* Gen. 37, 15; Josh. 24, 15) ⁽¹⁾.

This word **መኩ**, as being the Personal Interrogative, must always be used, but only then, — when enquiry is made after Persons. In the case of things (*masc.* and *fem.*) recourse is had to an Interrogative with an Impersonal or Neuter formation, **ምንት** "What?", fashioned from the Stem **መን** (which is also involved in **መኩ**) with the Fem.-ending **ት** ⁽²⁾. This **ምንት** is (like **መኩ**) found both in the grammatical Plural and the grammatical Fem., *e. g.* **ምንትኩ : ዛቲ : አበሳ** "What manner of transgression is this?" Josh. 22, 16; **ምንት : ውእቱ : እሉ : እመንቱ** ⁽³⁾ "What manner of things are these?" Hen. 52, 3; and it likewise regularly forms an Accusative **ምንተ** "What?" (*Acc.*).

Both **መኩ** and **ምንት** are employed alike in Independent and Dependent Interrogation, *e. g.* Matt. 10, 11; Hen. 12, 1, and both are often strengthened with interrogative particles (§ 198). In a negative sentence, whether it be a direct negative or an interrogative sentence with the force of a negative, both forms

(1) In the *Org.* LUDOLF even found **ኃ** (§ 143) combined with **መኒ**: **መኒኃ : እጼውዕ** "Whom shall I call?". Cf. also Matt. 27, 21, Roman Ed.; Isaiah 51, 12 *var.*—Notice the change from **መኒ** to **መኩ** in *Chrest.* p. 104, line 25 *sq.* and p. 105, lines 3, 5.

(2) This **ት** accordingly represents the neuter gender here, in the department of the Pronouns, where the Fem., when used with reference to persons, has *ī* or *ā* for its sign. On this point and on the connection of **ት** with the Indo-European Neuter-ending, v. EWALD, '*Hebr. Spr.*' §§ 172, *a* and 173, *a*.

(3) [FLEMMING reads here **እመንቱ : እሉ**, changing the order of the last two words. TR.]

assume the signification of an *Indefinite Pronoun* = “any one who”, “anything which”⁽¹⁾; and then with the help of **ኢ** they indicate the notion of “no one”, “nothing”,—in which combination the enclitic particle **ሂ** or **ኒ** “also” may be applied, and **ወ** “and” be prefixed over and above, *e. g.* **ኢመኑሂ** “no man” Ex. 34, 24; Matt. 8, 28; **ወኢመነሂ** “no one at all” (*acc.*) Matt. 17, 8; **ወኢምንትኒ** “nothing whatever” Cantic. 4, 7; **ወኢምንትሂ** Matt. 27, 12; **ወኢከመ፡ምንት** “and not as anything”, *i. e.* “as nothing”, Ps. 38, 7; **እፎ፡ይክል፡መኑሂ** “How can any one?” Matt. 12, 29. Both forms may also fall into the Genitive by having a noun placed before them in the Constr. St., or externally by means of **ዘ**,—**ዘመኑ** “Whose?”; **ዘምንት**.

Besides the neuter **ምንት** another form also makes its appearance, viz. **ሚ** “What?” (On its origin *cf.* § 63). This particle is often used, it is true, as a mere Interjection or Exclamatory Adverb, “How!” “How much!” (*e. g.* **ሚበዝኑ** “How many are!” Ps. 3, 1), but still it often also has the force of **ምንት** “What?”, and in that case it is nearly always joined to the succeeding word: **ሚሀለወክሙ፡ትግበሩ** “What will ye do (then)?” (v. § 89), Hen. 101, 2; **ሚላዕሌነ** “What is that to us?” (*lit.* “What upon us?”) Matt. 27, 4; John 21, 22; [**ሚላዕሌየ** “What is that to me?” *Kebra Nag.* 84 b 18;] **ሚሊተ፡ወለከ** “What have I to do with thee?” (*lit.* “What to me and to thee?”) 1 Kings 17, 18. But upon the whole this **ሚ** is obsolete.

(c) **መኑ** at least cannot be used directly as an *Adjective*; on the contrary a periphrasis must be employed for that purpose, made up of **መኑ** and **ዘ**, *e. g.* “What man is able?” **መኑ፡ወ-አቱ፡ሰብእ፡ዘይክል** *i. e.* “Who is the man that is able?”. As to the Pronoun **ምንት**, although such a periphrasis is likewise employed with that interrogative, it may more readily take another noun in apposition (§ 198). But, over and above these, the language has also a special *Interrogative Adjective* (§ 63), **አይ**⁽²⁾ “Which?” or “What?” (*adj.*), “What sort of?”, which has been developed into an *Adjective* out of an old *Interrogative particle* **ሄ**, and takes numbers, genders and cases. So much of its original inflexibility,

(1) [The indefinite pronoun may also be expressed by **ዘ** (*cf. supra*) or by **አይ** (v. end of this §), and occasionally also by **ብእሱ** (*cf.* § 173).]

(2) For the accentuation v. TRUMPF, p. 548.

however, still adheres to it, that it has no special form for the Fem. Sing., nor, so far as known hitherto, for the Masc. Plur.; and as in all probability it is not used with reference to Persons, but is only connected with words descriptive of things and notions, the other possible forms suffice for all cases. Thus the usage in the Singular is **በአይ: ሥልጣን** "By what authority?" Matt. 21, 24; **በአይ: ሰዓት** "At what hour?" Matt. 24, 42; **ለአይ: መዋዕል** "For what time?" 1 Pet. 1, 11; **በእንተ: አይ: ኅጢአት** "On account of what sin?" Hen. 21, 4; and in the Plural **አያት** "Which?" (viz. **ትእዛዛት**) Matt. 19, 18. In the Acc. Sing. it takes the regular form **አይ**, e. g. **አየኑ: ቤተ** "What house?" Acts 7, 49. Like **መኑ** and **ምንት** it is used both in direct and in indirect interrogation, and like these too it is often strengthened by enclitic Interrogative particles, particularly by **ኑ** (Matt. 22, 36; Acts 7, 49). On **አይ** as an *Indefinite Pronoun* = *quicunque, qualiscunque, quilibet, quisquis* cf. DILLMANN'S 'Lex.', col. 795. *sub* (2).

3. Personal
Pronouns:—

§ 148. 3. *Personal Pronouns (Pronomina Personalia).*

(a) The
Third
Pers.
Pron.

(a) *The Third Personal Pronoun*, in accordance with § 65, takes the form **ውእቱ** in the Masculine and **ይእቲ** in the Feminine, "he", "she" ⁽¹⁾. Like the other personal pronouns, it is originally Substantive in character, but it is also used quite generally, just as the Hebrew **הוא** ⁽²⁾, as an Adjective in the sense of *αὐτός*, "same" "even the", and also, in contrast with **ዝ** and **ዝንቱ** for "that" ⁽³⁾, to indicate what is somewhat remote; or, when united to **ዝ** or **ዝኩ**, to express "this very", "that very", e. g. Hen. 89, 9; 106, 16; or when united to **ዘ**, "who" "even he who", e. g. **ዘውእቱ** "even he who" Matt. 10, 4; Hen. 15, 4 (*pl.*). Now in so far as **ውእቱ** is a Substantive Pron., it takes no independent Accusative-form (v. § 149); but as an Adjective it admits of an Accusative, which is contrived, just like that of **ዝንቱ** and **ዛቲ**, by

(1) For the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 548 *sq.*

(2) In Tigre **ሐቱ**, **ሐታ** &c. have still retained the original **ה** of **הוא**; cf. NÖLDEKE, 'W. Zeitschr. f. d. K. d. M.' IV, p. 294 [and LITTMANN, 'Zeitschr. f. Ass.' XII, p. 193]. V. also D. H. MÜLLER, ZDMG XXXVII, p. 349 and N. 2; 393, N. 2.—On the *ē* in the formation of the Fem., v. BARTH, ZDMG XLVI, p. 685 *sqq.*; on the secondary form **ይኢቲ**, v. KÖNIG, p. 119.

(3) Often in particular it takes the place of the Plural of **ዝኩ**.

changing **ቱ** or **ቲ** into **ተ**, thus:—**ውእተ**, **ይእተ**. The word has two forms of the Plural, according as emphasis is put on the first or the second member of the combination. In the first of these cases, **ቱ** continues unchanged (as in § 146), and only the elements **ውእ** and **ይእ** are put in the Plural, which then takes the form **እሙንቱ** *emüntū* (originally *ümüntū*) in the Masculine, and **እማንቱ**⁽¹⁾ *emāntū*⁽²⁾ in the Feminine, like **እሎንቱ**, **እላንቱ**. If the emphasis rests upon the second element of the Compound, the Plural takes the form of **ውእቶሙ** for the Masc., and **ውእቶን** for the Fem. In this case the element **ውእ** is used without change for both genders, and thus comes to be employed in the Fem. instead of the **ይእ** of the Singular.—In the Plural **ቶሙ** (where *ō* seems to have sprung out of *ū* by a farther broadening of the vowel), the final *ū* is to be judged of, just as it is in **ሙ** [= Assy. *šunu*] the side-form of **ሙ**. In **ቶን** (a formation from **ቱ**, not from **ቲ**, and sprung out of *tu-ān*) the final vowel *a*, which is possible according to the Arabic **هَنَ**, has never been made use of, or, if so, has fallen away again. The distinction between these two forms of the Plural appears originally to have been that the first was used rather for the Pronoun as an Adjective, and the second for the Pronoun as a Substantive. But later usage has almost wholly obliterated this dis-

(1) When it is considered that the Plurals formed from **ቱ** are **ቶሙ**, **ቶን**; from **ሁ**, **ሆሙ** and **ሆን**; and from **እል**, **እሎን** and **እላን**,—the inference drawn here, as well as in § 132, is that one mode of forming the Plural is the lengthening of the Singular-ending combined with a nasal utterance. Accordingly a Plural *ūm* is expected from the Sing. *u^e* (**ውእ**), while from *i^e* (**ይእ**) no Plur. at all seems to have been formed. This *ūm* was then strengthened by the farther attachment of the Plural-ending *ōm*, *ān*, by which the Gender was denoted at the same time, and the first *ū* was thereupon shortened: whence came *umūm*, *umān*, as in **ሙሙ**, **ሙን**; **ሙሙ**, **ሙን**. The difference in gender in these Plural terminations is signified by a difference in the vowel,—*ū* marking the Masc., and *ā* the Fem.,—just as in **ሁ** and **ሃ**, while *m* is the Nasal corresponding to *ū*, and *n* the corresponding one to *ā*. V., however, TRUMPP, p. 548, N. 1, [who gives a very different account of the origin of the Form. TR.]

(2) [PRAETORIUS, 'Aeth. Gr.' apparently does not recognise the distinction noted here, for he marks the accents, p. 23 like TRUMPP, *emüntū*, *wē.*-'*ētōmū*, *emāntū*, *wē'ētōn*. TR.]

tion, and retained only one trace of it, in the preference shown for **ወ-አቶሙ** rather than for **አሙንቱ**, whenever this Pron. represents the copula (§ 194). There is no Accusative attached to either of the two forms of the Plural; when called for, it is usually indicated by a suff. Pron. followed by **ለ**(¹).

(b) *The Second Personal Pronoun* has the form **አንተ** "thou" (§ 65), and although no *ū* makes its appearance in this Masculine form, as might have been expected according to § 146 *sqq.*, manifestly because *ta* itself is just an abbreviation from *twa*,—yet it is faced in the Feminine by the regular formation in *ī*: **አንቲ**. The Plural in the Masc. is **አንተሙ**, in the Fem. **አንተን**. **አንተሙ** is manifestly formed from **አንቱ**, after the analogy of the Plural **ወ-አቶሙ** from **ወ-አቱ**, by *tū* becoming *tūm* and, with the addition of *u*, *tūmu*, the *u* of *tū* being finally shortened into *ē*(²), as the accent rests upon *ān*-(³). With less certainty can it be determined whether the Fem. **ትን** is formed from **ቱ** or **ቲ**, and whether accordingly it was at first *tōn* or *tīn* (*cf.* **أَنْتِ** and **أَنْتِ**).

The First
Pers. Pron.

(c) *The First Person* **አኔ** "I" is of common gender. It has arisen, it is true, like the Arabic **أَنَا**, out of an original **አንኔ** (§ 65) by casting off the last syllable **ን**; but the Suffix Pronoun **ኔ** (§ 149)(⁴) shows that at one time a second form **አንኔ** was known also in Ethiopic. The Plural has the form **ንሐኔ** (*nēhna*), and has come, like **نَحْنُ** and **נַחְנָה**, from **አንኔ** by repeating the entire Stem *anahanah* ("I" + "I" = "We"), and gradually shortening this double form.

Formation
of the
Accusative
and
Genitive
in the
Pers. Pron.

§ 149. *Formation of the Accusative and Genitive in the Personal Pronouns.* The three Persons in these Pronouns,—in Ethiopic just as in the rest of the Semitic languages,—whatever be the gender or number, share in the peculiarity of no longer

(1) But *cf.* *e. g.* Numb. 21, 25 [and *Kebra Nag.* 52 b 3.]

(2) According to KÖNIG, p. 120 this alteration depends upon a kind of Dissimilation.

(3) [But TRUMPP says, p. 549: "It has farther to be noticed particularly, about **አንተሙ** that the Tone does not rest upon **አን**, as DILLMANN thinks, but upon *ēmmu*". PRAETORIUS, '*Aeth. Gr.*' p. 23 also gives the pronunciation —*āntēmmū*. TR.]

(4) Also the Amharic **አኔ**.

possessing any independent Accusative-form. They cannot even, like the other Pronouns, be subordinated in their independent form to a Constr. St.⁽¹⁾, nor do they admit of the prefix **H** by way of Genitive-sign. But in order to meet both cases of subordination,—both that under the Verb, in the Accusative, and that under the Noun, in the Genitive,—forms of the Pronouns specially abbreviated and sometimes greatly altered have been contrived, which are joined to the Verb or Noun by way of attached particles (*enclitica*), and which are therefore usually called *Pronomina Suffixa*. These particles blend so completely with the word to which they adhere, that the entire combination has only one Accent. The same Suffixes are used for both kinds of Subordination; but, in the case of the First Pers. Sing., a somewhat shorter form has been developed for the Genitive-Suffix than for the Suffix of the Accusative,—which is to be explained as being after all merely a result of the different method of attachment in the two cases. These appended forms of the Personal Pronoun are as follows⁽²⁾:—(1) for the Third Pers. Sing. Masc. **ሁ**, Fem. **ሃ**; Plural Masc. **ሁሙ**⁽³⁾, Fem. **ሃን**. They are abbreviations (§ 62) of **ቱ**, **ታ**, **ቶሙ**, **ቶን**, as forming second member in **ውእቱ**, **ውእቶሙ** &c. To be sure, the form of the independent pronoun in the Fem. Sing. is **ይእቲ** and not **ይእታ**, *ī* being more widely used in Ethiopic in general as the corresponding feminine to *ū* in the department of the Pronouns. And yet **ዛ**, confronting **ዝ**, and **እንታከቲ** show that even here *ā* was a possible vowel for the Fem. Pronoun. Besides, after **ታ** was reduced to **ሀ**, *ā* associated itself more readily than *ī* with both forms, through the influence of the Aspirate. In this respect Ethiopic coincides completely with the other Semitic languages. (2) The form for the Second Person Sing. Masc. is **ከ**, Fem. **ከ**; Plural Masc. **ከሙ** (*kémmū*), Fem. **ከን** (*kén*). These forms too are just as clearly abbreviations of **አንተ**, **አንቲ**, &c., except that, in accordance with §§ 65 and 101, *t* has in each case passed into *k*,—a

(1) But cf. **ወእምድኅረ : ውእቱ : ተናስሐ**. *Phlw.* 164.

(2) For the accentuation v. TRUMPF, p. 549.

(3) That **ሁሙ** may stand for the Sing. **ሁ**, cannot be proved from Luke 2, 4; John 19, 27; Acts 1, 20,—as is the opinion of LUDOLF DE DIEU, 'Critica Sacra', p. 226 on Is. 53, 6, and of GESENIUS, 'Lehrgeb.' p. 216, 6, and SCHLOTTMANN, 'Inscript Eschmunazars' p. 111.

transition which here came about, all the more readily that the introductory syllable **hʔ** had fallen away, and that the retention of **t** (*t*) was no longer called for by the proximity of a dental Nasal. Farther, in **hṁ** which invariably has the accent, the long *ū* (*kūmu*), although no longer retained, is yet made up for by the doubling of the *m*, just as in **كُنْ**, **הִנֵּה** &c. (3) The Suff. Pron. of the First Person takes, in the Sing., the form **z** as a Verbal Suffix, and **ʔ** as a Nominal Suff.—In the Plur. the Suffix is **ʔ** for both Verb and Noun. Of these Suff.-forms **z** is an abbreviation of **hz**—a possible side-form of **hʔ** (§ 148, *c*), while **ʔ** has been shortened from **ʔhʔ**. **ʔ** however has been developed in the first place from *ī*,—which still frequently occurs in Ethiopic⁽¹⁾,—in the same way as **ṣ** from **ṣ̄**⁽²⁾, specially to avoid confounding the Suff. Pron. with the binding-vowel *ī* (§ 153). The *ī* itself is manifestly nothing but an abbreviation of *nī*,—a very ancient abbreviation, however, common to the Semitic tongues, and to be explained in fine by the fact of the Suffixes aiming at a still closer union with the Noun than with the Verb. All the Suffixes thus start with a consonant, although the four forms of the Third Pers. easily part with their Aspirate. The forms **hṁ**, **hʔ**, **ʔṁ**, **ʔʔ** are always accented: the others have given up their accent, **z**, **ʔ**, **ʔ**, **ʔ**, **ʔ**, however, merely transferring it to the immediately preceding binding-vowel, whereas **h**, **h** leave unchanged the accent of the word to which they are attached⁽³⁾. A special observation must be farther made, on the *signification* of these Suffixes,—viz. that the Suffixes of the Third Pers. may refer to the Subject of the clause, and may thus have a reflexive meaning. This holds good with the Nominal Suffixes in particular, *e. g.* **ʔhʔ** “for himself”, Gen. 5,3; **ʔhʔṁ** “behind them” (*hinter sich*), Gen. 9,23.—It is not so common with the Verbal Suffixes, § 151.

It is in the guise of these Suffix-forms then that the Personal Pronouns are usually appended to Verbs and Nouns, when they have to take the Accusative or the Genitive. (On the manner of

(¹) In **ʔhʔ** (§ 166), **ʔh** (§ 167), **ʔhʔṁ** (§ 163).

(²) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 97.

(³) [But *cf.* on the whole subject of the accentuation of the Suffix Pronouns, TRUMPP, p. 549 *sqq.* TR.]

attachment v. § 151 *sqq.*). But seeing that cases may also occur, in which such attachment of the Pronoun is not available, or in which a special emphasis rests upon the Pronoun, which cannot be suitably expressed in the form and position it has as Suff. Pron., the language has fashioned some other special forms by means of which a Personal Pronoun may be placed independently and emphatically in the Accusative and Genitive, and even in the Nominative.

§ 150. *Expression of the Acc., Gen. and Nom. of a Personal Pronoun, on which a special emphasis rests.*

(a) When a Personal Pronoun in the *Accusative* possesses special emphasis, by being either tacitly or expressly set over-against another Person, and by having on that ground (§ 196) to be brought into prominence by means of an independent and emphatic position in the sentence, Ethiopic may employ in such a case the expedient of combining a Pronominal Substantive, meaning “self” [*Selbstheit*], with the Genitive Suffixes of the Personal Pronouns, in the sense of “the self of me”, *i. e.* “myself” &c. This Substantive is (v. § 65) **ከያ**, to which the Suff. Pronouns are applied⁽¹⁾:—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1 st Pers. ከያየ	1 st Pers. ከያሃ
2 nd “ {m. ከያከ {f. ከያከ	2 nd “ {m. ከያከሙ {f. ከያከን
3 rd “ {m. ከያሁ {f. ከያሃ	3 rd “ {m. ከያሁሙ {f. ከያሁን

Expression
of the
Acc., Gen.
and Nom.
of a Pers.
Pron. on
which a
Special
Emphasis
rests.
Emphatic
Acc.-form of
Pers. Pron.

This Accusative is in very frequent use, but it is available only when a certain emphasis is associated with the Pronoun: **ከከያየ : ተወክረ : ተወክሮ : ለዘረነወኒ** “he who receiveth *me*, receiveth him that sent me” Matt. 10, 40; **ከያሁ : በሕቲቶ : ታምልክ** “*him* only shalt thou worship” Matt. 4, 10; **እሮ : እንከ : ረድፋደ : ከያከሙ** “how much more then (clothe) *you*” Matt. 6, 30; **ከያሃ** “even it” (the city Gazer) Josh. 16, 10. At the same time an impersonal use may be made of the Third Pers. Sing. Masc.: **አከኑ : አሕዛብኒ : ከያሁሰ : ይገብሩ** “do not even the heathen the very same?” Matt. 5, 48. And such a Pronoun may even be more exactly

(1) For the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 550.

determined by means of a Noun in the Accusative, employed like an Apposition: **ኪያሃ : ምድረ** “even it, the land”, *i. e.* “the land itself” Josh. 12, 6; **ኩሎ : ኪያሁ : መጽሐፈ** “actually the whole book” Hen. 89, 70. 77; **በኪያሆን : መዋዕል** *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις* Judith 4, 6; 6, 15; 8, 1. And in Hen. 67, 11 the pronoun even stands with an Accusative (or Nom.) set in anticipation absolutely⁽¹⁾: **ውኪያሁ : ማያት** “and as to even it, the water”, *i. e.* “and the very water”. *Cf.* also **ወአልበሶ : አልባሰ : ኪያሁ** *Chrest.* p. 29, line 25, and **ወአኮ : ኪያክ : ባሕቲትከ** *G. Ad.* 40, 7.

Emphatic
Gen.-form
of
Pers. Pron.

(b) In order to form an emphatic, or even a merely independent Genitive from the Personal Pronoun, the three forms of the Relative-sign, which is also the Genitive-sign, **ዘ**, **እንቲ**, **እለ**, are combined in Ethiopic with the Genitive Suffixes of the three Persons, the binding vowel *i-a* (§ 153) being interposed⁽²⁾.

Sing. m.	ዚአዩ	ዚአከ	ዚአከ.	ዚአሁ.	ዚአሃ
	ዚአነ	ዚአክሙ.	ዚአክን	ዚአሆሙ.	ዚአሆን
f.	እንቲአዩ	እንቲአከ	እንቲአከ.	እንቲአሁ.	እንቲአሃ
	እንቲአነ.	እንቲአክሙ.	እንቲአክን.	እንቲአሆሙ.	እንቲአሆን
Plur.	እለአዩ	እለአከ	እለአከ.	እለአሁ.	እለአሃ
	እለአነ	እለአክሙ.	እለአክን	እለአሆሙ.	እለአሆን.

In signification these forms have always the force of Possessive Adjectives: **ዚአዩ**, **እንቲአዩ**, **እለአዩ** mean “mine”, [*lit.* ‘who or which (*m., f. sing., or pl.*)—of my possession’] referring respectively to possessions which belong to the Masc. Sing., the Fem. Sing., & the Plur. But they are never placed simply beside the Noun, like other adjectives (after the fashion of *uxor tua*), but demand always the Constr. St. in front of them, thus: **ብእሲት : እንቲአከ** “the wife of thine” *i. e.* “thy wife”. When then they have to be dealt with as ordinary adjectives, they must once more be preceded by the Genitive-sign: **ብእሲት : ዘእንቲአከ** “the wife who is in or of thy possession”. Thus: **በፍትወት : እንቲአሁ** “by his own lust” Jas. 1, 14; **በኩሉ : ርኩሰ : ዚአሆን** “in all their (*f.*) impurity” Hen. 10, 11; 41, 5 & 8; 63, 3; and in Acc.,—**ርኢኑ : ኮከበ : ዚአሁ.** “we have seen his star” Matt. 2, 2; 6, 33; or **ዐውደ : ዚአሁ.** “in that circuit of his”, *i. e.* “round about him” Hen. 47, 3. It is only when the noun,—

⁽¹⁾ [*i. e.* by way of *absoluter Vorhalt.*]

⁽²⁾ For the accentuation v. TRUMPF, p. 550. [For the lengthening of the **አ** before the suffix in old Mss., v. *Kebrā Nag., Introd.* p. XVI.]

to which these forms refer and by which they regulate their gender and number,—stands already in the Constr. St. (whether because a Suff. Pron. is already appended to it or because another word depends upon it) that they can be set beside the noun freely and simply, *e. g.* በአተ : ካዕበት : እንቲአሁ (for በ" : ካ" : በአተ : እ") "his double cave" Gen. 23, 9; ወዳዲ : ነፍሱ : እንቲአሁ (where እንቲአሁ merely emphasises again the *ō* of ነፍሱ) "and even his own life" Luke 14, 26; አርዳኢከ : እሊኦከ "thine own disciples" Luke 5, 33; in the last case the Possessive may be placed first: ለእሊኦከ : አርዳኢሁ "to his own disciples". Farther, the Relat. Pron. may fall away, if the Possessive come first in order: እንቲአሁ : ሕይወት (for ዘእ") Hen. 38, 6. Since in this way then the Possessive is always conceived of as a Substantive to a certain extent, it may easily assume the position of a Predicate: ዚኦከ : ይእቲ : መንግሥት "Thine is the kingdom" (¹) Matt. 6, 13, or that of a Subject: —ተስክልዎ : እሊኦከ "his (followers) asked him" Mark. 4, 10. In particular, the form that comes first to hand (*masc.*), ዚኦከ, ዚኦከ &c., has often completely the character of a Neuter: "mine" [*das Meinige*] &c.: እምዚኦከ "of mine" John 16, 14; ውስተ : ዚኦከ "unto his own" John 1, 11; or, omitting the Noun, to which it refers: እስመ : ኮነ : መከፈልቶሙ : ለደቂቁ : ይሁዳ : ዐቢዩ : እምነ : ዚኦከሆሙ "for the portion of the children of Judah was larger than what properly belonged to them" Josh. 19, 9, although in such cases the Relative may be prefixed a second time: ይኩንከ : ለከ : ዘዚኦከ ἔστω σοι τὰ σά Gen. 33, 9. The inflection of the Relative Pron. which appears in this Possessive as its first element, following the Gender and Number of the Noun to which it refers, is farther attended to in this case with a greater sense of urgency, on account of the independent position of such Possessives, and consequently with a stricter observance of the rules, than in the case dealt with in § 147, *a*.

(*c*) But the *Nominative* also of Personal Pronouns has occasionally to be brought into special prominence, as contrasted with other Persons, *e. g.* "even I", "I myself" &c.; and this case sometimes extends also to Demonstratives: "even this", "this very" &c. To express the idea of "*idem*", "even the", it is often enough, in the case of the Dem. Pron. (§ 148, *a*), to compound it

Emphatic
Nom.-form
of
Pers. Pron.

(¹) Properly—: "Something belonging to Thee is the kingdom".

with **ውእቱ, ይእቲ** &c. But the language may place another special particle beside Demonstrative and Personal Pronouns, — **ከመ** “nearly”, “just”, “only” (§ 162), which always stands next after them, and may be applied to any Case, *e. g.*: “from eternity to eternity” **አንተ : ከመ** thou art the same” Ps. 89, 2; 92, 3:— **ከ.ያሁ : ከመ : ቃለ** “the very same word” (*acc.*) Matt. 26, 44; **ዘንተ : ከመ : ሰማዕኩ** “this very thing have I heard” Ps. 61, 11; **ገብረ : ከማሁ : ከመ** “he did the same thing” Matt. 20, 5.

In order to express the idea of “self” in the case of the three Persons, the particle **ለለ** “he, he” *i. e.* “he himself” (*cf. supra*, p. 117, § 62, 1, *c*) is, in Ethiopic, compounded with the Genitive Suffixes, by means of the binding-vowel *i* (¹):—

<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
1 st Pers.	ለለ.የ	1 st Pers.	ለለ.ነ
2 nd ”	{ m. ለለ.ከ f. ለለ.ከ.	2 nd ”	{ m. ለለ.ከመ. f. ለለ.ከን
3 rd ”	{ m. ለለ.ሁ. f. ለለ.ሃ	3 rd ”	{ m. ለለ.ሆመ. f. ለለ.ሆን.

Instead of **ለለ.የ, ለለ.የ** (*laléya*) also may appear, in accordance with § 153, *e. g.* 1 Cor. 4, 3; Ps. 50, 4; Gen. 45, 12 Note; **ለለ.የ** also occurs:—Gen. 45, 12 GC (KÖNIG, p. 153). This compound is always used as a Nominative. For the Accusative the compound with **ከ.ያ** (*v. supra* under *a*) or with **ርእስ** (*v. infra*) is employed: **ሶበ : ከሥነ : ለለ.ነ : ርእሰነ** “if we would judge ourselves” 1 Cor. 11, 31; **ለለ.ሆመ : ያክምሩ** “they themselves know” Acts 22, 19; **ዘለለ.ከ : ሣረርከ** “which Thou hast founded” Ps. 8, 4; **ለለ.ሃ : ፍኖ ቶመ : ዕቅፍቶመ** “it itself, their path”, *i. e.* “their very path is the occasion of their fall” Ps. 48, 13; *cf.* also Josh. 10, 1, 4; 17, 18; 22, 2; 23, 3. And in this signification **ለለ** is frequently introduced alongside of the independent Personal Pron.:—**ውእቱ : ለለ.ሁ : እግዚአብሔር** Josh. 22, 23; **ውእቱ : ለለ.ሁ : ኤዶም : ውእቱ** *αὐτός ἐστίν* Ἐδώμ Gen. 36, 1.

The notion of “self” may be indicated periphrastically, for every case except the Nominative, by means of **ርእስ** “head” (²)

(¹) For the accentuation *v.* TRUMPF, p. 551.

(²) Which has become in Amharic completely a Pronoun of the Third Person, as **እርሱ**.

with a Suff. Pron. appended. It occurs very frequently: **መኝ** : **ጥራሴ** : **ርእሰክ** “whom makest thou thyself?” John 8, 53; Matt. 8, 4; Gen. 19, 17; **ይሣየሙ** : **ለርእሶሙ** : **መብልዐ** “(that) they may buy themselves food” Matt. 14, 15; also Hen. 10, 2; Numb. 31, 53; Josh. 11, 14; *Chrest.* p. 24, line 4; p. 43, line 8. This periphrasis is employed, in particular, when the Pronoun is subordinated to a Preposition, *e. g.* **ላዕለ** : **ርእስክሙ** “against yourselves” Josh. 24, 22. **ርእስ** may refer even to things impersonal in themselves, but thought of as persons (*i. e.* personified): **ጌሶም** : **ለርእሳ** : **ትሔሊ** “the morrow will take thought for itself” Matt. 6, 34. The word **ነፍስ** “soul”, “life” is less frequently employed to indicate “self”, and is only made use of when the same idea may stand for “self” in other languages: **መጠወ** : **ነፍሱ** : **ለሞት** “he delivered himself to death” (*Liturg.*); Gen. 19, 17; Josh. 23, 11; G. Ad. 5, 3 *sq.*; 7, 4 (where **نفس** will stand in the original Arabic) &c.

§ 151. *Attachment of the Verbal Suffixes*, viz. to the Perfect, Subjunctive and Imperative. On the Infinitive v. § 155.

Attachment
of Verbal
Suffixes.
Binding-
vowel.

The Suffix is attached to the Verb by way of Object, and thus in the Accusative-form of subordination. In by far the greater number of cases also, the Suff. Pron. with the Verb represents the Accusative of the Personal Pronoun. But since, following § 143 and § 174 *sqq.*, the Accusative in Ethiopic admits of a much wider signification and more manifold use than in other tongues, and indicates often the notion “with respect to”, the Suff. Pron. is naturally employed in Ethiopic not only for the Accusative, but also for the Dative of the Personal Pron.,—the Dative in fact which in an independent word is throughout denoted by the preposition **ለ** “with respect to”, “for”. Attempts at a Dative-use of the Suff. Pron. are met with, as is well-known, in other tongues also⁽¹⁾. In Ethiopic all Intransitive, Reflexive, and Passive Verbs may assume a Suff. Pron. with the force of a Dative: **የአክለነ** “suffices us” Josh. 17, 16; **ይትረገወክሙ** “it shall be opened unto you” Matt. 7, 7; **ይኔይሰክ** “it is better for thee” Mark 9, 45; **ይትኃለቆ** “is reckoned to him” Rom. 4, 5; **ይብቁልክ** “it shall grow for thee” Gen. 3, 18; **እዌስክክ** “I will give thee more” Tobit 5, 15. In particular **ኮነ** and **ሀለወ** “to be” take this Dative, *e. g.* **እሙንቱ** : **ፈታሕተ** : **ይከውኑክሙ** “they shall be to you for judges” Matt. 12, 27;

(1) EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 315, *b*; HOFFMANN, ‘*Gr. Syr.*’ p. 315.

ኮኒኒ “it has happened to me” Tobit 8, 16. A Suffix of the third person may then take a reflexive meaning (§ 149) **ከመ : ትከኖ : ብኢሰቶ** ⁽¹⁾ “that she may become his wife”, (*lit.* ‘that she may be to him for his wife’) Gen. 28, 9 ⁽²⁾.

To be sure, this Dative use has really its origin in the Accusative use; and accordingly the Suffix is joined to the Verb in the same way in both cases. The same vowel *a*, which is the mark of the Accusative with the Noun (§ 143), is placed here before the Suff. Pron. to denote the Accusative, by way of binding-vowel between Verb and Pronoun ⁽³⁾.

In combination with the binding-vowel the Verbal Suffixes (*cf.* § 149) run as follows:

1 st Person.		2 nd Person.		3 rd Person.	
		<i>m.</i>	<i>f.</i>	<i>m.</i>	<i>f.</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>á-nī.</i>	<i>a-ka;</i>	<i>a-kī.</i>	<i>á-hū, contr. ō;</i>	<i>áhā, contr. ā.</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>á-na.</i>	<i>a-kémmū; a-kén.</i>	<i>a-hómū, ,, ōmū; a-hón, ,, ón</i> ⁽⁴⁾ .		

But this intervening vowel does not appear regularly, except when Suffixes are attached to those personal forms of the Verb which end in a Consonant, and even then not invariably. When such forms end in a vowel, the binding-vowel is often pushed aside by these vowel-endings. The Subjunctive, even in such of its forms as end in a consonant, constantly rejects the binding-vowel before the four Suffixes of the Second Person ⁽⁵⁾, because short, compact expression is characteristic generally of that Mood, and because the binding-vowel is not retained by the Accent. The Accent, in fact, is always attracted to *kémmū* and *kén*, while *ka* and *kī* have become entirely devoid of accent, and even the binding-vowel, where it does precede them, is unaccented (§ 149). The four Suf-

⁽¹⁾ [This is hardly an instance of reflexive meaning in the Suffix, for the Suffix of the third person here does not refer to the grammatical Subject of the clause. TR.]

⁽²⁾ [A peculiar use of the Suffix occurs in *Kebra Nag.*, p. 65 b. 3: **አፍጠኖ : ሐተተ** he ‘hurried the questioning with respect to him’, *i. e.* “he asked him quickly”.]

⁽³⁾ *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 247, b. On the other hand v. KÖNIG, p. 141 sq.

⁽⁴⁾ V. on the other hand TRUMPP, pp. 551, 554 sq.

⁽⁵⁾ So that *e. g.* **ይከኝከመ** Matt. 9, 29 in PLATT’s edition is decidedly inaccurate; [the Reprint, however, has the correct reading, **ይከኝከመ**.]

fixes of the Third Person are mostly contracted, after **u** has been thrown out (§ 47), particularly when the Verbal-form ends in a consonant. The following are the detailed rules for attaching these Suffixes to the Verb.

1. All personal forms of the Verb which end in a consonant, with the exception of those of the Subjunctive, have the Suffixes of the First and Second Person attached to them by means of the binding-vowel, those of the Third Person being applied in their contracted form. The Persons of the Subjunctive which end in a consonant have the Suffixes of the Second Pers. appended directly, without any binding vowel; while the Second Pers. sing. masc. of the Imperative does not admit of the Suffixes of the Second Pers. being appended at all. The Second Pers. pl. fem. of the Perfect, as **ነገርክን**, very seldom appears with Suffixes⁽¹⁾, and then it transforms its **ክን** into **ክ**, acquiring thus the same final sound as the Third Pers. plur. fem.; cf. **ረሰይከሁ : ለውዳሴ : ቅድሚክን : ኢብጹሐ** Cyr. a Reg. in Tüb. MS. fol. 25, b. At the same time, we do meet with forms like **ሐፀንክኖሁ**, **ሐቀፍክኖሁ**.⁽²⁾

1. Attachment when Pers. Forms of the Verb end in a Consonant.

2. Of the Persons of the Verb which end in **ä**, **ነገረ**, **ነገርክ**, **ነገርኑ**, the First Pers. Plur. Perfect retains its **ä** even before the binding-vowel **a**. The short **ä** blends with the latter into **ā**, and contraction with the binding-vowel is thereby usually prevented, even in the case of the suffixes of the Third Person⁽³⁾. The Second Pers. Sing. Masc. Perfect,—which is never followed by the Suffixes of the Second Person—, gives up its **ä** before the binding-vowel **ā**, regularly in the case of Suffixes of the First Person and

2. When they end in **ä**.

(¹) Examples: Ex. 2, 20 and Cantic. 5, 8 (where LUDOLF has introduced an inaccurate correction into the text).

(²) V. CORNILL, '*Das Buch der weisen Philosophen*' (Leipzig 1875), p. 51; and cf. KÖNIG, pp. 133, 141; PHILIPPI, ZDMG XXXII, p. 71; and NÜLDEKE, *ibid.* XXXVIII, p. 417. V. also PRAETORIUS, *ibid.* XLI, p. 690 [and BROCKELMANN, *ibid.* LIX, p. S31].

(³) I prefer the explanation of the long **ā** given above, to the other explanation, defended also by KÖNIG, p. 141, according to which we have in this **ኖ** merely a return to the original pronunciation of the **ኑ**, as it appears in the Arabic **ع**. In fact in the *Josippon*, at least in *Cod. Frez.*, the forms **ነገርኖ**, **ነገርኖሙ**, **ነገርኖን** occur rather more frequently than **ነገርኖሁ**, **ነገርኖሆሙ** and **ነገርኖሆን**; and they occur also in *Sx.* frequently, e. g. **ሰአኖ** *Sx. Genb.* 28; **ረከብኖ** = **ረከብኖን**, and **ቀበርኖ** = **ቀበርኖን** *Sx. Genb.* 28 *Enc.* [Cf. also *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XVIII.]

Plur. Suffixes of the Third Person, and occasionally and capriciously in the case of Singular Suffixes of the Third Person, the type in the latter case being either **ነርህ**, **ነርሃ** or **ነርከ**, **ነርከ** ⁽¹⁾. The Third Person Sing. Masc. Perfect gives up its final *a* before all Suffixes (§ 91), and takes the Suffixes of the Third Person invariably in their contracted form.

3. Attach-
ment when
Pers. Forms
end in
formative-
ū.

3. In those Persons of the Verb which end in a formative-*ū*, as **ነርከ**, **ነሩ**, **ነርከሙ**, **ይነሩ**, **ትነሩ**, **ይንገሩ**, **ትንገሩ**, **ንገሩ**, the binding-vowel *a* is thrust aside by the *ū* before all the Suffixes of the First and Second Person. In such cases *ū* takes over the accent, whenever it must have fallen upon *a*, if that vowel had been retained (*e. g.* in **ነርከሙኒ**). Suffixes of the Third Person are always attached in their shorter and vowel-commencing form *ō*, *ā*, *ōmū*, *ōn*, originating in contraction with the binding-vowel, *ū* being at the same time hardened into *w* before these vowels, *e. g.* **ነርዎ**, although a mere semi-hardening (§ 40) is often exhibited in this case, particularly in the older manuscripts, *e. g.* **ሰሐቡዎ**, **ገበርኩዎሙ**, **ገበርከሙዎ** ⁽²⁾, **ዘኣውዓእኩዎ** Amos 9, 7 (A), **አምሰጥከሙዎ** Herm. 22 *b*, 19.

4. When
they end in
Fem.
formative-*ī*.

4. The Persons which end in the Fem. formative-*ī*, **ነርከ**, **ትነሪ**, **ትንገሪ**, **ንገሪ**, do not assume any Suffixes of the Second Person. The Suffixes of the Third Person are attached in that form which begins with a vowel and which originates in contraction with the binding-vowel, the *ī* undergoing sometimes complete hardening, sometimes semi-hardening.—The semi-hardening is of specially frequent occurrence in the older manuscripts—: *e. g.* **ትሉዊዮን** Ruth 2, 8; **ሕፀንዮ** and **ሕፀኒዮ** Ex. 2, 9 (Note); **ግበርያ** and **ግበሪያ** Gen. 16, 6 (Note); [*cf. Kebra Nag.* p. XVIII]; **አጽንዒዮ** Gen. 21, 18 (Note); **ትሰምዩዮ** *Chrest.* p. 74, line 21 ⁽³⁾. On the other hand the Suffixes of the First Person admit in this case of no binding-vowel or hardening of the *ī* into a semivowel, because doubly-closed syllables would thereby be produced in most cases within

⁽¹⁾ According to NÖLDEKE, ZDMG XXXVIII, p. 413, N. 1, **ነርህ** contains an *originally* long *ā*, like the Hebr. אַנְתָּ overagainst אַנְתָּ. KÖNIG, p. 132 explains the length in **ከ** by extension before an Aspirate. On the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPF, p. 551 *sqq.*

⁽²⁾ V. DILLMANN's ed. of the '*Oetateuch*', Comm. p. 5.

⁽³⁾ According to KÖNIG, p. 127, this takes place to avoid a hiatus.

the word (like **ገበርክየኒ**, **ትነሥእየኒ**); but the Verbal forms concerned weaken their final *i* into *ě* (¹),—which then probably receives the accent,—and attach to it **ኒ**, **ነ** without a binding-vowel. In this way forms are produced in the Perfect like **ነግእከኒ** Gen. 30,15; **አምሐልክነ** Cantic. 5, 9; **ኮንከኒ**, which seemingly must be pronounced *našā'kēnī*, *amhalkēna*, *kōnkēnī*; while in the Imperfect, the Subjunctive and the Imperative we have forms like **ትገበርኒ**, **ትነሥእኒ** Gen. 30,15, **ንግርኒ** Gen. 24,23, 47; **አብእኒ** Gen. 38,16; **ሀብኒ** Gen. 30,14; **እመንኒ** Gen. 35,17; **አስትይኒ** (from **አስትዬ**) Gen. 24,17, 43, 45; [**ኩንነ**, **ሀብነ**, **ሰአልኒ** *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XVIII]. These last forms are probably to be pronounced *tegabrēni* &c.

5. In those Persons which end in *ā*, **ነገራ**, **ይነገራ**, **ትነገራ**, **ይንገራ**, **ትንገራ**, **ንገራ** the binding-vowel *a* blends with the *ā* ^{5. When they end in *ā*.} into *ā*. Contraction in the Suffixes of the Third Person is accordingly not permissible.

§ 152. The various individual forms which are possible in this connection may be explained by these rules. A survey is given in Table VII. One or two cases, however, deserve farther and special mention. Special Cases of the Attachment of Verbal Suffixes.

In attaching the Suffixes to the Subjunctive it may happen, in accordance with § 151,1, that the first letter of the Suffixes of the Second Person, **ከ**, is brought into immediate contact with the Radical Palatal-Guttural, **ግ**, **ቀ** or **ከ**. In that case, when **ግ** or **ቀ** is concerned, the **ከ** of the Suffix passes into **ግ** or **ቀ** (§ 54): **ያርሐቀ** “(that) he withdraw thee” Deut. 13,11; **እነድጊ** “(that) I should leave thee” Ruth 1,16; **ኢይርሐቀ** *μη ἐκλείπῃς τὸν σὲ* Prov. 3,3; **ያውድቀ** Sir. 12,16; **ያዕርገ** G. Ad. 43,24. Instead of **ከከ**, when **ከ** is the Radical, only one character is written (§ 55): **እባርከ** “I will bless thee” Gen. 27,7, 10, 25; Ruth 2,4; **ይንስከ** “(that) he bite thee” *Chrest.* p. 44, line 11. The copyists have in this case often gone astray, and, because they no longer recognised the Suffix, they have set down sometimes the Verbal form without Suffix, *e. g.* **ትባርከ** for **ትባርከ** Gen. 27,4 (28,3), and sometimes they have made a Suffix of the Third Pers. Masc. out

(¹) This feminine *i*, on being brought into the middle of a word, would seem to have a general tendency towards a more fugitive pronunciation. KÖNIG, pp. 120, 153 assumes a Dissimilation here. Cf. also *supra*, p. 72, § 36.

of a Suffix of the Second Person Masc., *e. g.* **ይበርከ** for **ይበርከ** Gen. 48, 20 *et saepe*⁽¹⁾.

When a vowel-commencing Suffix, or one which is attached with the binding-vowel *a*, is applied to those Persons of the Imperfect, the Subjunctive and the Imperative of verbs *tertiæ gutturalis*, which end directly with the last radical and so have the foregoing *a* lengthened into *ā*, as in **ይምጸእ**, **ምጸእ**, **ይትፈሣሕ**, **ይትፈሣሕ** &c.,—then the same changes emerge, which appear in the conjugation of these verbs in applying to those forms Personal-endings commencing with a vowel (§ 103), thus:—**ይምጸእ**, **ይምጽኣኒ**; **ስማዕ**, **ስምዐኒ**, [**ንሥኣ** ‘*sume eam*’ *Kebrä Nag.* 55 b 14]&c.⁽²⁾ On the other hand, Roots which are also *mediae infirmæ* maintain the *ā*, just as they do in the inflection (§ 103):—**ይበእ**, **ይበኣኒ**, **ይበኣሙ** &c. **ምዕዐ** may also maintain the *ā*, *e. g.* **ኢትትመዓዖ** “be not angry with him” Gen. 44, 18, as well as **ትትመዐዐኒ**; *cf.* KÖNIG, p. 85.

Roots mediae geminatae may contract the repeated letter, exactly as in the inflection (§ 103), whenever a proper occasion occurs, that is to say when a Suffix, introduced by the binding-vowel *a*, or one commencing with a vowel, is applied to a form ending in a vowel-less radical, *e. g.* **ይነቦ** or **ይነብቦ**, from **ይነብብ**; **ኣምሥሙ** or **ኣምዕሥሙ**, from **ኣምዕዕ** &c.

Verbal forms from *Roots tertiae infirmæ*, which end in *ū* or *ī* as third radical, must harden the *ū* or *ī* before the binding-vowel into *w* or *y*, (exactly as in the inflection before vowel-commencing Personal terminations, § 103)⁽³⁾, *e. g.* **ይትልዋ** from **ይትሉ**, **ትልወኒ** from **ትሉ**, **ያሐይዎ** from **ያሐዩ**, **ኣሕይወኒ** from **ኣሕዩ**, **ኣለብወኒ** from **ኣለቡ** (Ps. 118, 34):—but in the Subj. with Suff. of the Second Person we have **ኢትሉከ** (Matt. 8, 19). Farther we have **ይፊኦዮ** from **ይፊኣ**, **ርእየኒ** from **ርኣ**, **ትዕስያ** from **ትዕሲ**, **ኣርእዮ** from **ኣርኣ**. But yet the semi-hardening process is also met with in this connection here and there, *e. g.* **ያበሊዩከ** Gen. 28, 3; Ex. 30, 4; Numb. 12, 11; **ኢፊሲዮ** Amos 8, 10 (A) *et saepe*.

(1) In G. Ad. 29, 10 TRUMPF has restored some of these forms on his own authority.

(2) And yet we have also the reading **ብላዖ** Deut. 12, 18, 22 instead of **ብልዖ** as in Deut. 14, 23; 15, 20. In Sirach 6, 12 some MSS. have **ይትኅበኣከ** for **ይትኅበኣከ**.

(3) For the accentuation v. TRUMPF, p. 556.

The shortened form **ይህ** “he said” (**ትህ**, **እህ**, **ንህ**, § 103) must also make the **ሐ** appear again before the Suffixes: **ይህለኔ**, **ይህለሱ** &c.

Like Arabic⁽¹⁾, Ethiopic has the faculty of appending *two Suffixes* to a Verb at one time. Verbs namely, which may govern two Accusatives (§ 177), may also assume two Suffixes. The rule of precedence with these Suffixes in such a case is this, that the First Person precedes the Second or Third, and stands next to the Verb, while the Second precedes the Third. Examples:—**ወሀብኩህ** Numb. 18, 8; **አሀብካሃ** Gen. 15, 7 (*cf.* KÖNIG, p. 133); **የሀይደካሃ** Deut. 28, 30; **የሀብክሙዋ** and **የሀብክምዋ** Josh. 9, 22; **የሀይደንዮ** Luke 9, 39; **ወሀበንዮ** G. A. 109, 10; **ሀበኒያ** Gen. 29, 21; **አብሐንኒያ** Ezek. 3, 2; **አወፋየኒዮ** Gen. 42, 37; **ሀብኒያ** Gen. 23, 9; **ወሀበኒዮን** Gen. 31, 9; **ተሀበናሃ** G. A. 57, 2 [**ሀብንዮ** “give (*f. Sing.*) it me” *Kebra Nag.* 99 b 23]. We also conclude from these examples, that, when the first Suffix ends in *ū* or *ī*, and a Suffix of the Third Person (*ō*, *ā*, *ōmū*, or *ōn*) is added, the *ū* or *ī* may undergo either complete- or semi-hardening⁽²⁾; still, the latter process is the more usual one (*cf.* KÖNIG, p. 153 *sq.*), the accent in that case falling upon the second Suffix (*cf.* TRUMPP, p. 556). If the first Suffix ends in *a*, the Suffixes of the Third Person are always applied in their original form (*hū*, *hā*, *hōmū*, *hōn*), and the foregoing *a* is generally lengthened into *ā*⁽³⁾, under the influence of the Aspirate and of the accent which it then takes.

§ 153. *Attachment of the Suffix Pronouns to the Noun.* Attachment
of Nominal
Suffixes.
Binding-
vowel. Pronouns are subordinated to the Noun just as other nouns are (§ 144), that is to say,—in the Genitive relation or possessive sense. Of course, as is pointed out in § 150, Ethiopic is furnished with an expedient for deriving from every Personal Pronoun independent Possessives which it may employ with the force of a Genitive. Their use, however, is almost wholly restricted to cases in which a certain emphasis is laid upon the Genitive, or in which the attachment of a Suffix is impracticable on other grounds,—for instance when a Construct State has to be dealt with. But

⁽¹⁾ EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 674.

⁽²⁾ And yet in the very ancient *Cod. Laur.* there occurs, in Zech. 3, 1:—

ወአርአየኒህ : እግዚአብሔር : ለካህን : ዐቢይ.

⁽³⁾ V., however, Numb. 14, 8; Deut. 6, 23; 9, 6.

when such special cases do not present themselves, every Personal Pronoun, which has to take the Genitive, is even in Ethiopic attached usually to its governing Noun as a Suffix, *e. g.* መዋዕሊሁ “the days of him”, “his days”. The power to subordinate a Pronoun to a Noun in this way—depends upon the process of juxtaposition, just as in the case of a Construct State (§ 144); and wherever Suffixes with the force of a Genitive are appended to a word, it is really a Construct State-relation which is then constituted. Now (§ 144) this relation may be conceived, and in other languages may even be realised, without any outward formative expedient, so that by ranking the two words close together and accentuating them in a certain way the whole force of the relation is embraced already. Accordingly it might be thought that even in Ethiopic the Suffixes would attach themselves closely to the Noun without recourse to any farther contrivance, and give expression to the Genitive relation by thus blending together the two elements into one single word. In actual fact, however, this is not the case. For in Ethiopic, just as the Construct State is invariably formed by means of an Ending, so the Suffix in every instance is attached to the Noun by means of a *Binding-vowel* corresponding to such Ending. But this binding-vowel is no longer retained in all instances with the same fidelity to its original form. In order therefore to understand its essential nature, it is necessary to distinguish the different cases which occur.

1. Attach-
ment of
Suffixes to
Plural
Forms.

1. The Binding-vowel appears in its purest form in the case of the attachment of *Suffixes to the Plural* of the Noun, whether outer or inner Plural. Plural-forms subordinate the Suffix by means of the binding-vowel *ī*, which always carries the Tone, except when the Suffix itself requires it, as in ክሙ, ክን, ሆሙ, ሆን (§ 149). This binding-vowel is of such essential importance, that, for the sake of it, even the *a* of the Accusative is given up; and accordingly when an Accusative Plural has to take a Suffix, the sign of the Accusative disappears, and the Accusative relation is recognisable only from the context. In this *ī*, which agrees in a remarkable manner with an ancient ending of the Construct State in Hebrew, we can only discern a Construct State-ending; for seeing that the fuller form *īa* is given in the cases adduced in § 150, *b*, it is probable that both the usual Ethiopic ending of the Construct State, *a*, and the binding-vowel, *ī*, are merely two

different abbreviations of one and the same fundamental form *īa* (§ 144)⁽¹⁾. This binding-vowel *ī* is reduced to the feebler *é* on phonetic grounds in two cases: (a) before the Suffix **የ**, by *ī*+*ya* becoming *éyya*, or again by *ī* being weakened into *é* before *ya*, producing *éya*⁽²⁾. Yet this is by no means always the case; in particular, forms with *īya* are often exhibited in older manuscripts, like **አደዊየ**, **አምላኪየ** &c.; cf. KÖNIG, p. 153; [and *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XVI]. (b) Before the Suffix **ከ**, *ī* may be shortened into *é*, plainly to obviate the necessity of two *ī*-sounds being heard in immediate succession. The Suffixes which are attached to the Plural accordingly take the following forms (cf. TRUMPP, p. 557):—

	I.		II.		III.	
		m.		f.	m.	f.
Sing. <i>é-ya</i> .		<i>ī-ka</i> ,	{ <i>ī-kī</i> . <i>é-kī</i> .		<i>ī-hū</i> ,	<i>ī-hā</i> .
Plur. <i>ī-na</i> .		<i>ī-kémmū</i> ,	<i>ī-kén</i> .		<i>ī-hómū</i> ,	<i>ī-hón</i> .

For Examples v. Table IX. The form *īya* *e. g.* is given in **አበዊየ** Gen. 32, 10; 47, 9, 30; **አምላኪየ** Gen. 48, 3; **አኅዊየ** Judges 8, 19; the form *īkī* in **አበዊከ** Ps. 44, 18; *ékī*, **አልባከከ** Cantic. 4, 11; **ከፍፍርከ** *ibid.*; Ruth 3, 3 (G). If the Plural-Stem ends in **የ**, then the approach of the binding-vowel produces **የ**; but before Suffixes of the third Person **የ** occurs only rarely, as for instance in **እከደሁ** (a side-form to **እከደሁ**), v. DILLMANN'S 'Lex.', col. 789; **የ** inclines rather to blend with the *ī*-sound into *é* (cf. TRUMPP, p. 558): **መራዕዩሁ** *marā-ī-hū* = *marā'ihū*⁽³⁾ Gen. 21, 22; 26, 26; **መራዕዩሁም** Gen. 34, 23; **ከሎ : ንዋዩሁ** (Acc. and Col-

(¹) TRUMPP also, p. 557, N. 1, holds *ī* to be the remains of an old Constr. St.; cf. *supra*, p. 325, Note (¹), as also KÖNIG, p. 142.

(²) There is no express announcement that *y* has to be pronounced double in this case, and the alternative possibility is brought nearer by the shortening of the *ī* before **ከ** into *é*.

(³) [It looks more like *marā'yehū*, as if *ihū* had also been shortened into *e-hū*, and applied to **መራዕዩ**, thus *marā'y^e-ehū*, which easily blends into *marā'yehū*; but not so obviously does *marā'y^e* and *ihu* blend into *marā'ihū*. However DILLMANN thinks **መራዕዩ** should be pronounced as if it were written **መራዒ** (v. § 51 *sub fin.*). TRUMPP's pronunciation of the word is *marā-eihū*. Perhaps too the binding-vowel has disappeared in these cases, v. *infra*. TR.]

lective, v. *infra* § 155) Gen. 32, 24; **ዕበይሁ** (Acc.) Tobit 13, 4; and also with Suffixes of the second Person **ንዋይክሙ** (for **ንዋይክሙ**) Ex. 10, 24; **ገማዕይሆን** Matt. 25, 4; and in Ex. 38, 26 there occurs even **መጻህዩን** from **መጻህዩ**, the binding-vowel having been hardened into a semivowel and the *h* thrown out (but see *annot.* on the passage). And yet, seeing that every Plural in Ethiopic, particularly the Inner Plurals or Collective forms, may without difficulty be conceived again as a simple Singular notion, it is not much to be wondered at, that Suffixes are frequently applied to Plural forms after the fashion of Singulars; v. *infra* § 155.

§ 154. 2. When Suffixes are attached to Singular forms,

the binding-vowel *i* is shortened into *e* or is entirely given up. At the same time we must distinguish between Nominal-Stems ending in a vowel and those ending in a consonant.

(a) *Nominal-Stems, ending in ā, ē, or ō*,—in whatever way the termination has arisen—, have the Suffixes attached without any binding-vowel, in all the Cases of the Noun, just because the latter vowel is absorbed by the long vowel, *e. g.* **ሥራኅ** “his glory” Ex. 24, 17; **ግማኖሙ** “their impurity” 2 Esr. 9, 11; **ተፈልጦሙ** “their separation” G. Ad. 11, 19; **ትክቶን** (instead of **ትክቶሆን**) M. M. f. 192. In **ሱታፌ**, even the *ē* of the Nominal form is discarded; *cf.* DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’, col. 367 (v. Table IX).

(b) *Nominal-Stems ending in a Consonant.*

(α) When these Stems stand in the *Accusative*, the Suffixes are appended to them⁽¹⁾ in like manner without any binding-vowel, inasmuch as the *ā* of the Accusative is too important to be thrust aside, and the binding-vowel is unable to obtain a foothold alongside of it. It is true that *a* and *i* might have been contracted into *ē*, but such mixed sound did not come into use with the ordinary Noun, and it is exhibited in the case merely of a few Prepositions which have Suffixes attached (§ 167). It is only before the Suff. **የ**, where the binding-vowel *i* or *ē* has a support in the *y*, that it is regularly strong enough to dislodge the *ā* of the Accusative, so that **ሕዝበ** + Suff. **የ** runs,—not **ሕዝበየ**, but **ሕዝብየ** *hezbéya*⁽²⁾.

(1) For the accentuation *cf.* TRUMPF, p. 556 *sqq.*

(2) Of course the form **ሕዝብየ** might be explained as coming from an original **ሕዝበ**; and thus it might be supposed that the *ā* of the Accusative was in this case displaced by the Vowel-Suffix *i* (§ 149); and in like

Now seeing that the binding-vowel, except in this one case, disappears, the *a* of the Accusative must assume the accent which the binding-vowel would have had to sustain: as *á-na*. But instead of *á-hū*, and *á-hā*, *ó* and *á* are always given in pronunciation, the Aspirate being suppressed. Thus: **ሕዝብኒ**, **ሕዝቦ**, **ሕዝባ**; but **ሕዝብክ**, **ሕዝብኩ** with the accent on the tone-syllable of the Stem; farther **ሕዝባክሙ**, **ሕዝባክን** with the accent on the Suffix; and finally, instead of **ሕዝባሆሙ**, **ሕዝባሆን**, always the contracted forms **ሕዝቦሙ**, **ሕዝቦን**, the Aspirate being rejected. Even before other Suffixes than **የ**, it happens occasionally that the *a* of the Accusative gives way to a binding-vowel *e*, *e. g.* **ሕግክ** in the Acc., Numb. 18, 3 (F); **አምላክክ** Lev. 25, 36; **አምላክክሙ** Lev. 25, 38; 26, 12; 3 Kings 1, 14 where the oldest manuscripts have **ነገርክ** for **ነገረክ**; *cf.* also **ርእሰክኒ** Sir. 38, 21; **አእምሮትክ** *Tab. Tab.*⁽¹⁾ 60 (*Chrest.* p. 122 [where *Cod. Mon. Aeth.* 11, fol. 49 v^o reads **አእምሮተክ**]); **ረድኤትክ** *Tab. Tab.* 79 (*ibid.* p. 126 [*Codd. TRUMPF, Francof. and Mon.* 11, fol. 57 v^o give **ረድኤተክ**]); **PLATT**, ‘*Didasc.*’ p. 5, line 10⁽²⁾; **ሕግክ** and **ጽድቅክ** in Laur. 4 Esr. 10, 39 (54); 13, 55 (58) and 4 Esr. 8, 12; 9, 32 (New Ed.), to avoid the disagreeable sound of **ገክ**, **ቀክ**; also **ሐዘንክ** in 4 Esr. 10, 15 (20)⁽³⁾.

manner *eya* with the Plural-forms might be thought derivable from an original *i*: but **የ** as occupying the position of the Suffix *i* appears to be very old, as old forms like **ምስሌየ** (§ 167) prove; and even before other Suffixes the *ā* of the accusative is thrust aside, in old MSS.

(¹) [*i. e.* **ጠቢብ** : **ጠቢባን** or *Sapiens Sapientium*. TR.]

(²) [The reference here is to **ጸላእትክሙ** “your enemies (acc.)” which **PLATT** found in his MS. and considered a mistake, as he explains in a note. He restores the *a* in the Text and writes **ጸላእተክሙ**. Evidently **DILLMANN** thought the *e* legitimate enough, though not quite common. TR.]

(³) **LUDOLF** also lays down the rule, that, when a Noun in the Acc. with a Suffix is farther weighted with another attached particle like **ኒ**, **ሂ** &c., the *ā* of the Acc. passes into *e*, *e. g.* **ተዘከር** : **ሣህለክ** : **እግዚአ** : **ወምሕረትክኒ** Ps. 24, 6; other instances are Ps. 88, 6 (contrasted with v. 2); 71, 1; 87, 12; 91, 2 (contrasted with Ps. 70, 20, 21). These cases, however, are rather to be explained in accordance with § 143, *ad fin.*, the accusative construction being held in abeyance there, and the first form of the Noun appearing instead of the Acc. [From the numerous instances met with in the *Kebra Nag.* (v. ‘*Introd.*’ p. XVI sq.) of this formation of the Acc. in *e* before Suffixes of

(β) When
they stand
in the
Nominative.

(β) When the Noun stands in the *Nominative*, the binding-vowel *e* makes its appearance before the Suffixes of the First and Second Person, taking the accent at the same time before **የ** and **ነ**, thus: *é-ya*, *é-na*, *e-kémmū*, *e-kén*. But the Suffixes of the Third Person are not given as *e-hū*⁽¹⁾, *e-hā*, *e-hōmū*, *e-hōn*, but as *ū*, *ā*, *ōmū*, *ōn*, the Aspirate being discarded and the binding-vowel suppressed. For the rest v. Table IX. Words, which end in **ግ**, **ቀ**, **ከ**, **ይ**, **ን**, are prevented by the binding-vowel from ever making these letters coalesce with those Suffixes which commence with the same letters or similar ones (*cf.* KÖNIG, p. 96), thus **ጸወን** (not **ጸወነ**); **አምላክከ**, **ራእይ** Hen. 14, 4; **ደቂቅከ** Gen. 48, 5; **ወርቅከሙ** Gen. 43, 12. Words which end in *u*-containing Palatal-Gutturals, like **ኅልቀ**, **ሰርጉ**, attach in the Nom. and Acc. the Suffixes of the third Person, after the same manner as other nouns, observing however the principles noticed in § 42: **ሰርጎ**, **ሰርን**, **ሰርጎሙ**, **ሰርንን**; but in order to preserve the peculiar pronunciation of their last radical they may also adopt the full form *ehū*, *ehā*, *ehōmū*, *ehōn*, *e. g.* **ሰርጉሆሙ** Numb. 31, 49 (Acc.); **ሰርጉሃ** Deut. 17, 3. So too words ending in *ai* may take **ሁ**, **ሃ**, **ሆሙ**, **ሆን**, *e. g.* **እከይሆሙ** Judges 20, 34, 41 (= **እከየሙ**), but this seldom happens.

To Nouns
ending in *ī*.

(c) *Nouns which end in ī* do not admit of any binding-vowel in the Nominative, but annex the Suffixes directly, just like other Stems ending in a vowel, and retain the Aspirate in Suffixes of the third Person. But *éyya* or *éya* is occasionally read for *īya*, *e. g.* **መድኅንየ** Ps. 18, 16; 68, 17 (from **መድኅኒ**); 90, 2.—*Cf.* also **ረሰዩክምዎ**; **ቀታሌየ** (*varr.* **ቀታሊየ** and **ቀታሌ**; **ዘአየ**) 1 Sam. 22, 13; **መጋቤሁ** Tob. 1, 13 Francof. When such nouns stand in the Accusative, the Accusative-sign *a* may be suppressed between the termination *ī* and the binding-vowel, at least pretty regularly before **የ**, **ሁ**, **ሃ**, **ነ**, **ሆሙ**, **ሆን**, *e. g.* **ረዳኢየ** Ex. 15, 1; **ፈጣሪሃ** Matt. 1, 16; **ፈዳዩሃ** Hen. 6, 3⁽²⁾; **ፈጣሪነ** Phys. 5, 12; *Hexaem.* 33, 6⁽³⁾. But before Suffixes of the Second Person, the *a* of the Accusative

the Second person, it would appear that this was the regular formation in Ge'ez at an early stage of its development.]

(1) An anomalous form occurs in Ex. 36, 12, **ባሕትትሁ**.

(2) [FLEMMING reads here **ፈዳየ**. TR.]

(3) Farther Numb. 35, 23; Deut. 4, 42; 21, 1; John 7, 32; Hebr. 11, 7; James 4, 4, 11.

is mostly retained, *e. g.* **ጸላኤከ** Matt. 5, 43; Ex. 23, 22; Deut. 32, 38; but v. **ጸባኢከ** Job 13, 24; **ነባሪከ** Sir. 4, 4 *var.* In Ex. 23, 25, **ፈጣሪከ** is to be explained in accordance with § 143 *sub fin.*

(d) A few short and old words have a somewhat anomalous method of attaching their Suffixes. The four nouns **አብ** “father”, **ሐም** “father-in-law”, **እኑ** “brother”, **አፍ** “mouth” restore to view before Suffixes their original termination, namely *ū* in the Ground-form, and *ā*⁽¹⁾ in the Accusative; but for that very reason they reject other binding-vowels: they also adopt the Suffixes of the third Person in their complete form. Accordingly, from the Nominative-form proceed **አቡዩ** (Ps. 26, 16), **አቡነ**, **አቡከ** (John 8, 19), **አቡኪ**, **አቡከሙ**, **አቡከን** (Gen. 31, 5), **አቡሁ**, **አቡሃ**, **አቡሆሙ**, **አቡሆን**; in like manner **እኑዩ** Luke 6, 42, **እኑከ** Matt. 5, 24, **እኑሁ** Gen. 38, 29; **ሐሙኪ** Gen. 38, 13, **ሐሙሃ** 38, 25; **አፉዩ** Ps. 16, 5, **አፉሁ** 9, 29, **አፉሆሙ** 5, 10, **አፉከ** Rev. 10, 9. In the Accusative these words ought properly to run **አባዩ**, **አባከ** Eph. 6, 2, **አባሁ** John 6, 42, **አባሆሙ** Mark 1, 20; **እኔከሙ** and **እኖከሙ** Gen. 42, 20 (Note), **እኖሆሙ** or **እኔሆሙ** Ps. 37, 21, **እኖሁ** Matt. 5, 22; Ps. 48, 7; **ሐማሁ** Ex. 18, 26; **አፉሁ** Matt. 5, 2; but they readily give up the Accusative form, and stand in their first form for the Accusative also. Thus there appear as Accusatives **አቡሁ** *Chrest.* p. 24, line 5; **አቡነ** Judges 18, 19; **አቡሆሙ** Gen. 4, 21; **አቡሃ** Deut. 21, 13; **እኑከ** Deut. 25, 3. In particular **አፍ** employs its first or Nominative-form for the Accusative almost without exception: **አፉሁ** Ps. 68, 19; Hen. 106, 3; **አፉሃ** Gen. 4, 11 (Note); Hen. 56, 8; **አፉዩ** Judges 11, 35; **አፉከ** Judges 11, 36; **አፉሆሙ** Ps. 9, 42; Hen. 17, 8. The Noun **እድ** “hand”,—although it exhibits **ው** in the Plural as its third radical, like the words just mentioned,—does not form **እዱዩ** &c., but always takes the form **እደ** before Suffixes, thereby indicating an original pronunciation of **እደ**, something like **ጸገ**, but

To certain
Short and
Old Words

(¹) Which *ā* is taken in exchange for *ū* in the very same way as *ā* is for *ē* in the ordinary noun. For the rest, in the case at least of **አብ**, a second Acc. occurs even without a Suffix, viz. **አባ** in Matt. 19, 29; *cf.* the Vocative § 142.—With reference to this peculiarity in the words mentioned, compare Arabic, Hebrew and Syriac; EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 411; ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 256, a, and HOFFMANN, ‘*Gr. Syr.*’ p. 273 sq.—V. also KÖNIG, p. 108. [*Cf.* farther NÖLDEKE, ‘*Syr. Gr.*’ (*English Ed.*) p. 91. TR.]

making no distinction between Nominative and Accusative: **አደዩ**, **አደከ**, **አደሁ** ⁽¹⁾, **አደኑ**, **አደክሙ**, **አደሆሙ** &c. ⁽²⁾.

§ 155. 3. Often however in Ethiopic the *Suffixes* are attached to *Singular Stems in the Plural fashion*, and *vice versâ* to *Plural Stems in the Singular fashion*.

(a) Singular-Stems,—by reason of similarity of meaning (that is when they convey the sense of a Collective noun) or still oftener similarity of form,—at times take Suffixes which belong properly to the Plural forms ⁽³⁾. Especially are Suffixes of the Plural adopted with almost perfect regularity by those Singular-Stems which contain a long *ā* before the last radical or formative letter, both on account of outward resemblance to the Plural type **አምላል** and because an *ē* as a binding-vowel would be too weak, after the long *ā*, to carry the tone. These stems almost invariably fasten the Suffixes to themselves, both in the Nominative and the Accusative, by means of *ī*:—**ቀርባኑ** Gen. 4, 4; **ምእላዲሁ** Gen. 1, 9; **ምግባኢከ** Gen. 3, 16; **ድንጋጊሁ** Josh. 3, 15; 4, 18; **ሙራዲሁ** Josh. 10, 11; **ምሐናኒከ** Ps. 2, 8; **ምሥዋዒሁ** Ps. 42, 4; **ምዕራቢሁ** Hen. 72, 2; **ሙባኢሁ**, **ሙዓኢሁ** Hen. 73, 3; **ልህቃተሃ** Luke 1, 36. Words also of the type **ሥርዐት** from roots *ultimae gutturalis* have here and there the same forms, in accordance with § 48:—**ከብሐተከ** Ps. 47, 9; 72, 28 (*cf.* § 121, *d*); **ርሥኦተሁ** Gen. 21, 2; but also **ምግባሩ** Ps. 61, 11; **ምግባሮሙ** Ps. 27, 5; **ቅድሳቱ** Ps. 29, 4; 96, 13 &c. In the very same way words of the Second simple formation, belonging to the type **ክብድ**, may, from their outward resemblance to the first Collective-form, attach their Suffixes by means of *ī*:—**ክብዲከ** Ps. 121, 7; **ጥበቢሁ** Ps. 146, 5; **ዕጸቢሁ** 2 Sam. 22, 6 &c.; also **ዐረቢሆሙ** Judith 1, 7. So is it, farther, with words of the type **መግባር** and **መግባርት**, particularly when they are used collectively, *e. g.* **ማኅደሪሆሙ** Ps. 48, 11 &c., and many other Singu-

⁽¹⁾ But **አዳ** is found in *Tab. Tab.* 53, 1; 66, 4 (*Chrest.* pp. 120, 123). For farther explanation *cf.* PHILIPPI, ZDMG XXXII, p. 74; BARTH, *ibid.* XLI, p. 637; KÖNIG, p. 107; *et supra* p. 286 and Note ⁽³⁾.

⁽²⁾ But when in Hen. 44 and Ex. 34, 13 the MSS have **ምስሌሆሙ** for **ምስሊሆሙ** “their images”, that form has been reached simply through the copyists mistaking the Conceptional word (‘image’) for the Preposition **ምስለ** (‘with’) (§ 167). [In Hen. 44, FLEMMING reads **ምስሌሆሙ**. TR.]

⁽³⁾ *Cf.* in Hebrew, EWALD, ‘*Hēbr. Spr.*’ § 259, b.

3. Suffixes
often at-
tached to
Singular
Stems in
the Plural
fashion, and
to Plural
Stems in
the Singular
fashion.

(a) 1st case,
when the
Sing. Stems
are similar
in form or
meaning to
Plurals

lar-forms besides, especially when used collectively, *e. g.* **ዓመቲኑ** Ps. 89, 10, **ዓመቲሆሙ** Ps. 77, 37.

(b) Plural-stems at times adopt suffixes properly belonging to the Singular, inasmuch as any Plural may be conceived of as a notion suggesting unity:—**ጸድቃኑ** Ps. 31, 14; 33, 16; **ላእካኑ** Ps. 102, 21; **ጸላኦቱ** Ps. 67, 1; **ጸላኦቶሙ** Ps. 105, 11; **ጸላኦትከ** Ps. 20, 8; **አብያቶሙ** Hen. 94, 7; **አሣእኖ** Matt. 3, 11; **ኅባዝያኑ** Gen. 40, 5; **አግብርቶ** Gen. 44, 16; **መዋዕሉሙ** Lev. 7, 36; **ጸሐፍቶሙ** Matt. 7, 29; **አልባሰኪ** (Acc.) Ruth 3, 3; **አጸብዕቶን** “their (f.) fingers” M. Berh. f. 43 a; **ምግባራቶ** (Acc.) G. Ad. 50, 17; particularly those Plurals which give expression only to a simple Singular-conception, *e. g.* **አምላክ** “God” or **መቃብሮሙ** Gen. 47, 30; **መቃብርክ** Gen. 23, 6.

(b) 2nd case, when the Pl. Stems may be conceived of as suggesting Unity.

4. Suffixes are also applied to the *Infinitive*, just as to ordinary nouns. Infinitives which end in *ō* take no suffixes, it is true, in that form (§ 125), for they must revert, before the suffix, to their original form in *ōt*⁽¹⁾; but suffixes are attached to both of the other possible Infinitive forms. The Gerund must always stand in the Accusative (§ 123), and thus it attaches the Suffixes just like other Nouns in the Accusative which have a consonantal ending (§ 154, *b, α*): **ወዲእዩ** Ps. 67, 24; **ርእይዩ** Ps. 72, 3; **ገቢረክ** Ps. 49, 21; **ተመደጠክ** Luke 22, 32; **ተንሢክ** Matt. 2, 14 &c. The Substantival Infinitives may be used both in the Nominative- and the Accusative-form, and they attach their Suffixes in these cases exactly like other nouns that end in consonants (§ 154, *b, α, β*), *e. g.* **አሚኖትከሙ** Nomin., **አሚኖተከሙ** Accus. On Suffixes in the case of Prepositions and other Particles v. *infra*, (§ 167).

4. Suffixes applied to the Infinitive.

§ 156. Lastly, as regards the *signification* of the Suffixes to the Noun, they must in the first place be an expression of the Genitive of the Pronoun (whether Subject-Genitive or Object-Genitive, § 184), because they are related to the Noun as a subordinate element to a Construct State (§ 153). In the large majority of cases this is the position which is actually met with. But just as (§ 184) the Construct State serves at times to determine a word with greater exactness by means of the second element, and may therefore be employed even in those cases in which other

Use of the Suffix in certain cases, equivalent to Apposition

(1) Accordingly **አስተፋቅዶሙ**, Numb. 26, 63 is not a good form, and Cod. C. gives a better one in **አስተፋቅዶቶሙ**.

languages make use of the co-ordinate relation or Apposition⁽¹⁾,—so too the Suffix to a Noun may annex a more exact determination to the Noun concerned. In such a case it would be expressed in our languages as in apposition to the Noun, *e. g.* **ዕረቅዩ**, literally “a naked one of (or ‘belonging to, or associated with a personality’) I”, *i. e.* “naked I” or “I, naked”. In this way, just as the Accusative-, or Verbal-suffix, is also used with a Dative reference (§ 151), a new signification of the Suff. Pron. has likewise branched off from the Genitive-, or Nominal-suffix. In Ethiopic this practice of subordinating in form, as a Genitive-suffix, a Pronoun which is coordinate in meaning, predominates largely in one case:—When a Personal noun, or an adjective expressing the condition of a Person, makes its appearance in free co-ordination, or as a predicate of a Personal Subject or Object in a sentence, it is not placed in the sentence in mere vacancy, but always in a form completed by the Suffix of the Person with which it is co-ordinated: **ገዩ : ዕረቅ** *lit.* “he fled a naked one, of a personality he”, *i. e.* “he fled naked” Mark 14, 51; **ያውድቁኒ : ዕረቅዩ** “let them cast me down (as a) naked (one of a personality I)”, *i. e.* “let them throw me down naked” Ps. 7, 4; **ሀለዉ : ዕረቃኒሆሙ** “they were naked” Gen. 2, 25; 3, 7 (**ዕረቅ**, in fact, is used only in this way: v. also Gen. 1, 2 Note; 3, 10; Hen. 32, 6, *et saepe*); **ተወልደ : ዕዉሩ** “he was born blind” John 9, 1, 13; **ሐረ : ትኩዙ** “he went away grieved” Mark 10, 22; Ps. 37, 6; **ይኒይሰከ : ትባእ : ውስተ : ሕይወት : ሐንካሰከ : ወፅዉሰከ : . . . ወ” . . . ነቋርከ** Matt. 18, 8, 9; **አኅዝዎ : ለንጉሥ : ሕያዎ** Josh. 8, 23; **ንበሪ : ማዕሰብኪ** “remain a widow” Gen. 38, 11 (where more exactly it should stand **ማዕሰብኪ**); **ይነብር : ትኩዙ** *Chrest.* p. 42, line 20; **ተረፉ : ቅውማኒሆሙ** G. Ad. 29, 26; v. also **ጥራዮ** in DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 1221. For other instances of this kind v. *infra* §§ 163, 2; 172, b; 189; and in the case of Numeral Adjectives § 191.

II. PRONOMINALS.

§ 157. 1. We find in Ethiopic a few *Compounds of Pronouns and Conceptional words*, which take the place held by Pronominal words in other languages.

(¹) Like **אִנְךָ אֶתְךָ** (Gen. 16, 12) in Hebrew, or the *Karma-dhārāya* Compounds in Sanskrit; [v. WILLIAMS’ ‘*Sanskrit Gr.*’ p. 281. TR.]

The conception “such” is expressed in Ethiopic, as in other Semitic tongues, by means of the preposition **ከመ** (§ 165)—which is itself of Pronominal origin—together with the Demonstrative **ዝ** or **ዝንቱ** “this”: **ከመዝ** Hen. 25, 7; **ከመ : ዝንቱ** Gen. 41, 38; or with a Suffix Pron.: **ከማየ**, **ከማሁ** &c. (§ 167). In both cases the relative pron. may also be prefixed: **ዘከማሁ** literally “*who as he is*” *i. e.* “such a—”; **ዘከመዝ** Matt. 17, 21; **ለእለ : ከመዝ** “for such” (Dat. pl.) Matt. 19, 14.

II. Pronominals:—1. Compounds of Pronouns and Conceptional Words taking the place held by Pronominals in other Languages.

The idea “so great” is brought out by means of the Constr. St. (generally Accusative too) of **መጠን** “measure”, *e. g.* **ሃይማኖት : መጠን : ኅጠት : ስናፔ** “faith (‘of the size of’) as great as a mustard-seed” Matt. 17, 20; **ሕለት : ወርቅ : ዘመጠን : በትር** “a golden reed (‘of the size of’) as large as a rod” Rev. 11, 1; similarly Luke 18, 16; or with **ዝ** or **ዝንቱ** appended, *e. g.* **መጠንዝ** “so great” Jas. 3, 4; **በመጠንዝ** “for so much” Acts 5, 8; or with the relative pron. prefixed also: **ዘመጠንዝ** “so great” (*lit.* ‘which is according to the measure of this’) Matt. 8, 10; 15, 33. In like manner **መጠን**, by leaving out the pron., may also signify “how great”, “how much” (in a relative sense or in a dependent question): “I will tell you **መጠን : ገብረ : ለነፍስዩ** (*lit.* ‘the measure of what’) how much he has done for my soul” Ps. 65, 15; Matt. 27, 13; Ex. 19, 4; in relative sense Gen. 34, 12. In order to convert it into an Interrogative, **ሚ** “what?” or “how?” (§ 63) is prefixed, which, at least in introducing a direct question, is indispensable: **ሚመጠን : ትሁቡኒ** “how much will ye give me?” Matt. 26, 15; **ሚመጠን : መዛርዐ : አግሐ ሥክሙ** Matt. 16, 9; 15, 34; Gen. 30, 29; 47, 8; Ps. 118, 84; Hen. 89, 62.—Notice also the peculiar word **ስፍን** properly: “prominence”, “size”, which is used only as an Interrogative in the sense of “how much?” “how great?” Originally **እስፍንቱ**, from interrogative **እ** (§ 63, b) and **ስፍንቱ**, means properly, “what is the size of it?” *i. e.* “how much?” (LUDOLF, *Lex.* p. 188), “how often?” (G. Ad. 45, 6); then, without an interrogative sign, **ስፍን** (“measure of”, for **ስፍን : ዘ**) = “how often?” Matt. 18, 21; and, finally, plain **ስፍን** “how much or many?” in the Nom. (LUDOLF, *l. c.*). In this case the interrogative force lies merely in the Tone.

2. So too there are several *Conceptional words which are only used when compounded with Suffix pronouns*. These words contain in fact nothing but quite general conceptions of space, measure or existence, and to that extent they stand always in need

2. Conceptional Words, used only when compounded with Suffix Pronouns.

of a complement. This complement they should in strictness have subordinated to themselves by the Constr. State, just like many other conceptional words,—blank in themselves,—which ordinarily complete their meaning only by means of a second word (§ 185)⁽¹⁾. The words which are now to be described, however, have this peculiarity, that they are never completed by a conceptional word, but always by a Suffix Pronoun and by nothing else⁽²⁾. The following are of this class.

The old Semitic word **ሁል** “entirety”, “totality” still occurs occasionally in independent form, but only as an Adverb (**ሁል** and **ሁላ** “everywhere” and “in every direction”, § 160). In other positions, however, it must always be completed by a Suffix, by means of which the completing notion is referred to, either beforehand or by way of addition. Then having been combined with its suffix into one word, it is always placed in free apposition beside the conceptional word to which it refers. As a rule, it is compounded with Suffixes of the third Person: **ሁሉ**, **ሁላ**, **ሁሎሙ**, **ሁሎን**; Accusative **ሁሉ** (§ 154, *b, α*), **ሁላ**, **ሁሎሙ**, **ሁሎን**. With the Singular suffixes it signifies “all”, “every”, “the whole of”; with the Plural suffixes “all the”. **ሁሉ** may stand by itself, and then it means “everything”, *e. g.* **እግዚአብሔር : ሁሉ** “the Lord of all”. However, it is generally connected with other nouns: **ሁሉ : ብሕሩ** or **ብሕሩ : ሁሉ** “every man” or “all men”; **ሁሎሙ : ነገሥት** “all kings”, or **ነፃ : ሁሉ**; **ሁላ : ምድር** or **ምድር : ሁሉ** “the whole earth”; **ሁሉ : መንፈስ** “all living beings” &c. Properly the suffix should be regulated in gender and number by the conceptional word to which it refers. But often enough the Masc. form **ሁሉ** appears for the Fem. **ሁላ**, even when the reference is to conceptional words of the feminine gender, as in **ሁሉ : መንግሥት** Luke 11, 17; and still more frequently the Singular **ሁሉ** appears in the expression of a Plural notion. Indeed any word may be continued in the Singular (and yet have a Plural force) alongside of **ሁሉ**,—even a word which in other positions never has a Collective meaning,—just because **ሁሉ** itself expresses collectivity:—**ሁሉ : ባሕር** “all seas” or “every sea”. Even when the notion “all” (*pl.*) stands entirely alone, **ሁሉ** may

(1) Such words occur in every Semitic language; *cf.* EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 209, *c.*

(2) Like **יְהוּדִים**, **יְהוּדִי** in Hebrew.

remain in the Singular: “all perished” **ኩሉ፡ሞተ** or **ኩሉሙ፡ሞቱ**. Many instances are also met with, in which **ኩሉ** is not adjusted to the Case of the word to which it belongs, but continues in its first form,—particularly if it follows the word,—inasmuch as the Case has been already indicated in that leading word and the whole relation between the two is only that of a loose co-ordination.—Then too, this word may adopt all the other suffixes (with the exception of **የ**), in the meaning “all of us” (“we all”), “all of you” &c; and it must assume these suffixes instead of those of the third Person, whenever the notion “all” (*pl.*) refers to the first or second Person: “we have all gone” **ኩልን፡ሐርን** or **ሐርን፡ኩልን**; so **ኩልክሙ** Matt. 23, 8; Ps. 2, 10; **ኩልክን**; *Accus.* **ኩሉን** Ex. 16, 3 &c.

From the Feminine form **ኩለት** sprung **ኩለንታ** in the sense of “entirety”, “totality”, by the attachment of the Collective-forming *ā* (§ 140, IV) and the insertion of **ን** (§ 58). This word in like manner appears only when completed by suffixes, and for the purpose of expressing the notion “whole”, in the sense of “in the whole being”: **ኩለንታየ** “I wholly” (‘my whole being’); **ኩለንታክ** “thou wholly” Luke 11, 36; **ኩለንታሁ** “the whole of him” Gen. 25, 25; Hen. 72, 4⁽¹⁾; **ኩለንታሁ፡ሥጋክ** “the whole of thy body” Matt. 5, 30; **ኩለንታሃ** “all of it (*f.*)” Gen. 13, 15; **እንተ፡ኩለንታሆሙ** “in the direction of their entirety”, *i. e.* “they in all directions”, “they wholly” Rev. 4, 8; **ኩለንታሃ፡ሌሊተ** “the whole night” Ex. 14, 20.

The word **ባሕቲት** “solitude” (§ 120, *a*) is always⁽²⁾ combined with suffixes, to bring out the notion, “alone”: **ባሕቲትየ** “my solitude” *i. e.* “I alone”; **ባሕቲትክ** “thee (*acc.*) alone” Ps. 50, 5; **ባሕቲቱ** “he alone” Josh. 22, 20; **ኪያሁ፡ባሕቲቶ፡ታምልክ** Matt. 4, 10; 10, 42; **ባሕቲትክሙ** “you (two) alone” Matt. 18, 15; **ባሕቲቶሙ** Matt. 17, 1; **ባሕቲቶን** Gen. 21, 28. But still it keeps here and there its Substantive meaning: **ባባሕቲቶሙ** “in their solitude”, “when they were alone” Mark 4, 10; [*Kebra Nag.* 97 a 11].

The word **ከንት**, besides, (compare: *gratis*, **ደገኑ** “in vain”) as Constr. St. **ከንቶ**, “emptiness”, “nothingness”, has always the suffix of the third Person sing. masc. (like **ኩሉ**) **ከንቱ**, Acc. **ከንቶ** to express “a thing of nought”, “a vain thing” Ps. 38, 8; 2, 1. But it is chiefly employed as an adverb, either in the form **ከንቶ** or com-

(¹) [FLEMMING’s reading here is **ኩሉ**. TR.]

(²) Cf. *supra* p. 360, § 156 **ዕራቅ**.

bined with **በ** as **በከንቱ** (§ 163). On a few other words compounded with the suffixes of the third Person, which occur always as Adverbs, v. *infra*, § 163; *ibid.* also on **ዓዲ** with suffixes.

III. NUMERALS.

III. § 158. The Numerals in Ethiopic are almost all of them the very same as in the other Semitic languages. As regards therefore their Root-formation, and partly also their Stem-formation, enquirers may at this point be referred to the grammars of these other languages.

1. *Cardinal Numbers* ⁽¹⁾. The Numeral for “one”, according to its root and its stem, has the form **አሐድ**; and, just as in other languages, it is properly an Adjective. When therefore it is connected with a Feminine conception, it assumes the Feminine termination: **አሐት** (for **አሐድት**, § 54). It no longer occurs, however, in these bare forms ⁽²⁾, but, like the demonstrative pronouns, it becomes a Personal Numeral by the attachment of the termination *ū* for the Masculine, and *ī* for the Feminine, so that the actual Numeral for “one” has always the form **አሐዱ** (*masc.*) or **አሐቲ** (*fem.*). It takes the Accusative, by changing, like the Pronouns, *ū* or *ī* into *a*: **አሐዱ**, **አሐቲ**. It is quite as incapable of taking the form of a Construct State as the Pronouns ⁽³⁾ are; and accordingly “one of them”, and the like, must be expressed as “one from them” **አሐዱ : እምኔሆሙ** &c.

The Numeral for “two”, employed by the rest of the Semitic languages, is indeed found in Ethiopic also, in a few scattered expressions like **ሰኑይ** “the second day” (‘of the week *or* of the month’) and **ሰኒት** “the following day”, but it has passed out of use as a Numeral proper. In its stead a fresh Numeral, viz. **ክልኢ** meaning properly “a pair”, and in form a Dual, § 131,—has been derived from the root **ኣኒ**, **ክልኢ** (“to separate”, “to divide”, “to hold back from anything”, “to hinder”). This numeral has

(1) On the *diptosis* of the Cardinal Numbers from “one” to “ten” v. BARTH, ZDMG XLVI, p. 691 sq.—For the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 558.

(2) A Plural **አሐዳት** “*uniones*” (*i. e.* Numbers from one to ten,—‘units’), v. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, is met with, Abush. (Abushakeri *opus Chronographicum*), 11.

(3) Cf., however, **አሐድነ**, *var.* **አሐደነ** Mark 10, 37.

points of connection with **כֵּלָתָן** and **כֵּלָתָן**. It occurs still, now and then, quite independently, as Subject or Predicate, in the sense of “a pair” or “two”, *e. g.* **הָאֵלֶּיךָ : שְׁנֵי** “two shall be” Matt. 24, 40; **הָאֵלֶּיךָ : שְׁנֵי** “a sword whose edge is two” (*i. e.* ‘which has two edges’ or “a two-edged sword”) Ps. 149, 6; or again it may, in the form of a Construct State, be completed by a Genitive, and then it generally takes suffixes, as in **הָאֵלֶּיךָ, הָאֵלֶּיךָ, הָאֵלֶּיךָ, הָאֵלֶּיךָ, הָאֵלֶּיךָ**, to express the notion “both of us”, “both of you”, “both of them”. But it may also,—and this is the usual case,—be connected, by mere apposition, with the idea, of which the two-fold character has to be declared, just like the other Numerals (*v. infra*), *e. g.* **הָאֵלֶּיךָ : שְׁנֵי** (*Acc.*) Gen. 48, 1. Now as gender cannot be expressed with the form **הָאֵלֶּיךָ**, the Feminine termination **ִית**⁽¹⁾ was applied, following the analogy of the other Numerals, and to this modified form *ū* for the Masc. and *ī* for the Fem. were added, (exactly as in **הָאֵלֶּיךָ**), whence we have *masc.* **הָאֵלֶּיךָ**, *fem.* **הָאֵלֶּיךָ** “two”, and an *Acc.* **הָאֵלֶּיךָ** for both *masc.* and *fem.* When the gender has to be distinguished with precision, one of these two forms is made use of; but when the gender is either of no consequence, or is quite obvious from the context, then even **הָאֵלֶּיךָ** may be employed. In loose diction we often have **הָאֵלֶּיךָ**, as the readiest form, even with names of things and notions which by grammatical gender are feminine.

The remaining Numerals from 3 to 10 are as follows:—

CARDINAL NUMBERS.

3—10.

<i>Masc.</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>Fem.</i>	<i>b</i>
3. שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁה		שְׁלֹשָׁה
4. אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבָּעָה		אַרְבָּעָה
5. חֲמִישָׁה	חֲמִישָׁה		חֲמִישָׁה
6. שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשׁ		שֵׁשׁ
7. שִׁבְעָה	שִׁבְעָה		שִׁבְעָה
8. חֲמִשָּׁה	חֲמִשָּׁה		חֲמִשָּׁה
9. תְּשֻׁעָה or תְּשֻׁעָה	תְּשֻׁעָה or תְּשֻׁעָה		תְּשֻׁעָה
10. עָשְׂרָה	עָשְׂרָה		עָשְׂרָה

⁽¹⁾ **הָאֵלֶּיךָ** “the being two”,—an abstract form.

All these Numerals are originally Substantives. True, in their earliest form and expression they had assuredly no Feminine ending; but at a pretty early stage Abstracts were formed out of them by means of the Feminine termination (in all the Semitic tongues), and this type became the usual one. In still later times, when these words were no longer put in due connection, like Substantives by means of the Constr. St., but like Adjectives by way of apposition, the gender also began to be distinguished in them. The form which was most in use at that time, viz. that which had the Feminine ending, was retained for the first or *Masculine* gender, while the ancient form or a newly fashioned shorter form, without the Fem. ending, was employed for the *Feminine* gender. In this general process of development Ethiopic agrees entirely with the other Semitic languages. But as regards individual forms, the form, contrived by means of ት, seldom occurs now in this naked shape, as e. g. in ሰብዐት Josh. 6, 13, although it could not be avoided in those cases at least in which the Numeral in the Constr. St. had to govern a Genitive, § 191, or to attach Suffixes to itself, e. g. ሠለስቲሆሙ literally “their ‘three’” i. e. “the three of them”; ሰብዐቲሆሙ “the (aforesaid) seven” Mark 12, 22; ዐሠርቲሆሙ 4 Esr. 3, 60. As a rule, these Numbers are no longer connected as Substantives in the Constr. St. with the numbered object, but as Adjectives and by means of apposition, § 191. They are accordingly converted from Abstracts into Attributive words, by the attachment of the Pronominal ending ሀ⁽¹⁾, exactly like ክልኤቱ; and when they take the Accusative case, they change this ሀ into *a*:—ሠለስቱ, ሠለስተ &c. In fashioning these forms, furnished with a feminine ት, a long vowel occurring in the ground-form must be shortened (§ 36):—ሠለስት from ሠላስ, ሰመንት from ሰማን or ሰማኒ, and hence ሠለስቱ, ሰመንቱ. And yet in Judges 3, 8, 14 we meet also with ሰማንተ (*Acc.*). The two forms ሰብዐቱ, ተስዐቱ,

(¹) ሠለስት is “the Three” (abstract Subst.), ሠለስቱ “three” (attributive word). It is true, one is apt to conceive of ሀ as an ordinary Suff. Pron. and to explain ሠለስቱ according to § 157 as “three of it”. But this is a wrong conception; for in that case the Accusative would be bound to have the form ሠለስቶ, which is not the case; and, besides, ክልኤቱ would be inexplicable. Rather is the formation the same as when a Demonstr. Pron. ቱ “he” with a Personal meaning is formed from the root ተ. Cf. also እስፍንቱ *supra*, p. 360, § 157, 1.

constructed in accordance with § 127, *a*, frequently pass into **ሰባ ስቱ**, **ተሰስቱ** ⁽¹⁾ in accordance with § 47, *sub fin.* Then, in the numeral “nine” **ትስዐት** is made use of quite as much as **ተስዐት**. For “eight” a form **ሰማኒቱ** is also met with, 1 Pet. 3, 20; Gen. 46, 22, preserving the *i*, from **ሰማኒ** (ሰማኒ) ⁽²⁾.

The form which is used as a Feminine, but which is Masculine in its type, is constructed from the foregoing form in **ት**, by throwing off the **ት** and reducing the word to its original, radical constitution. Two varieties are possible: 1.—Recourse may be had to the obsolete ground-form, for the purpose of re-introducing it into use, whence come **ሠላስ**, **ሠላሳ** (§ 18 *sub fin.*); **አርባስ**, **ሠላሳ**; **ጥምስ** ⁽³⁾, **ሠላሳ**, **ሠላሳ** (cf. **ሠላሳ**); **ሰባስ** [Kebra Nag. p. XVII]; **ሰማኒ** Josh. 21, 39, Numb. 35, 7, **ሠላሳ**, **ሠላሳ**; **ተስዐ** and **ትስዐ**, **ሠላሳ**; **ሰሥር** ⁽⁴⁾ **ሠላሳ**. 2.—Or an entirely new form may be fashioned, after the manner of Nouns of the First simple formation, as has been noted in the above list, in the second column of Feminine forms. This form, however, is not in very great favour. One or two examples are met with, as in 1 Kings 7; Deut. 3, 11; Ex. 37, 1; Ruth 3, 15; but it is chiefly used to form Numeral Adverbs (§ 159). Of the Fem. Numbers of the First form, those which do not end with a vowel, or do not have a long vowel in the last syllable, usually take *ū*, for the purpose of becoming Attributive words, exactly as the Masc. Numbers do. Thus we have **ስሱ** (for **ስሱሱ**) *séssū*, **ሰባሱ**, **ተስዐሱ** or **ትስዐሱ** ⁽⁵⁾, **ሰሥርሱ**; probably **ጥምሱ** may also be formed; **ሰሥር** also appears as a side-form to **ሰሥርሱ**. For “three”, “four”, “five”, “eight” the forms **ሠላስቱ**, **አርባስቱ**, **ጥምስቱ**, **ሰማኒቱ** are more generally used in association even with Feminine words, unless when a preference is given to **ሠላስ**, **አርባስ**, **ጥምስ**, **ሰማኒ**. But while an Accusative may still be formed for Masc. Numbers ending in **ቱ**, the forms **ስሱ**, **ሰባሱ**, **ተስዐሱ**

(1) LUDOLF held these forms to be the original ones.

(2) [On the relation between **ሠላሳ**, **ሠላሳ**, **ሠላሳ** cf. PHILIPPI, ‘Beitr. z. Assyrl.’ II, p. 364, Note ***, and PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVI, p. 695.]

(3) Occasionally written also **ጥምስ** (§ 48).

(4) Occasionally written also **ሰሥር** (§ 48).

(5) Josh. 21, 16; 15, 57.

and as a rule also **ዐሥሩ**⁽¹⁾, have become indeclinable, and even in the Accusative and before Suffixes they retain their *ū* (Numb. 8, 2). But no doubt **ጎምስ** and the entire Second series of the Fem. Numbers may enter upon the Accusative by appending *ā*.

For the Tens, from 20 to 90, a Plural-form should have been expected, according to the analogy of the other Semitic tongues. In fact they appear to have been formed at one time from the original ground-forms of the units by attaching the Masculine Plural-ending *ān*⁽²⁾; but in later times, because they no longer distinguished Cases or Genders, they allowed the Nasal at the end to disappear (§ 58)⁽³⁾. Accordingly we have:—**ሠላሳ** 30, **አርባ** 40 (for **አርባ**, § 45), **ጎምስ** 50, **ስሳ** 60 (for **ስድሳ**), **ሰባ** 70, **ሰማንያ** 80, **ተስ** 90 (*e. g.* Luke 15, 4, 7; Matt. 18, 12, 13) or **ትስ** (*e. g.* Gen. 17, 17). The form derived from 10, **ዐሥራ** (never **ዐሥራ**) serves, not for 100, but for 20,—a special word being used for 100.

The Numeral 100 is **ምእት**; Constr. St. and Acc. **ምእተ**; Plur. **አምእት** (§ 136, 2, c). The Semitic word for 1000 **አልፍ** has in Ethiopic rather the meaning 10,000; Constr. St. and Acc. **አልፈ**; Plur. **አአላፍ**; Plur. of Plur. **አአላፋት**. **ምእት** and **አልፍ** are both Substantives originally, but they are usually associated with the object numbered, by mere co-ordination, like all the other Numerals (§ 191). **አርባብ** and **ረባዋት** “myriads” are obsolete forms, very seldom used (§§ 136, 2, b; 134, c, β). **አልፍ** can be used in Ethiopic for the number 1000, only when the notion merely of a great number has to be signified, and exact enumeration is not required: thus *e. g.* in Deut. 33, 17 both *μυριάδες* and *χιλιάδες* are translated by **አአላፍ**: so too in Dan. 7, 10:—**አአላፈ : አአላፋት : ወትአልፊተ : ትአልፊት** *χίλιοι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριοι μυριάδες*; *cf.* Hen. 40, 1⁽⁴⁾ [and *Kebra Nag.* 141 b 18]. In more exact numerical expression 1000 must be signified by **ዐሠርቱ : ምእት** = 10 × 100;

(1) V., however **ዐሥሮን**, DILLMANN'S 'Lex.', col. 959.

(2) [The corresponding Assyrian forms, however, ending likewise in *ā*, are not in favour of this theory.]

(3) Much as the Personal-ending *ū* in the case of the verb came from an original *ūn*, *ūm*.—For the accentuation v. TRUMPP, p. 558.

(4) [FLEMMING reads here **አአላፈ : አአላፍ : ወትአልፊተ : ትአልፊታት**. TR.] [For another word for '1000', **ሒሕ**, v. *Kebra Nag.* p. XVII.]

thus 2000 is **ዕሥራ : ምእት**, 3000 **ሠላሳ : ምእት** and so on. 100,000 is **ዐሠርቱ : እልፍ**, and 1,000,000 **ምእት : እልፍ**.

When numbers have to be compounded by way of addition, the larger number generally comes first, and the smaller one is almost always joined on with **ወ**. As regards the numbers 11—19, it calls for special notice that like genders and forms are combined in all cases:—**ዐሠርቱ : ወአሐዱ** 11, **ዐሠርቱ : ወክልኤቱ** 12, **ዐሠርቱ : ወሠለስቱ** 13 &c.; or **ዐሥሩ : ወአሐቲ**, **ዐሥሩ : ወክልኤ** (Josh. 21,7, 38), **ዐሥሩ : ወሠላስ** &c.; or **ዕሥር : ወሥልስ**, **ዕሥር : ወርብዕ** &c. When numbers are compounded by way of multiplication, the smaller precedes the larger, and of course without **ወ**:—**ክልኤቱ : ምእት** 200, **ዐሠርቱ : ወአሐዱ : ምእት** 1100, or **ዐሥሩ : ወአሐቲ : ምእት** 1100 &c.

§ 159. 2. *Derived Numerals.*

(a) *Numeral Adjectives* or *Ordinals* are derived, in the form of an Act. Part. (§ 109, a) which is no longer much used for any other purpose—, from the ground-form, just as in Arabic [and Assyrian], and in fact from the tri-radical root-form, without regard to any firmer vowels, or to any fourth letter attached to the commencement or the end of the root and established in the ground-form; thus **ሣልስ**, **ራብዕ** &c. For “the first” an adjective is used which has been formed according to § 117 from the $\sqrt{\text{ቀደመ}}$, namely **ቀዳሚ**; for “the second” either the word **ከልእ** “the other”,—confined indeed for the most part to cases in which only ‘two’ are spoken of (*alter*),—or the word **ከዕብ**, already becoming obsolete, from the $\sqrt{\text{ከዕበ}}$ “to be double”,—or,—and this is the word most used—, **ዳግም** (**ደገመ** I, 2 “to repeat”, cf. **عَدَّ**, **عَدَّ** IV, VIII).

2. Derived
Numerals:
—Ordinal
Numbers.

The Feminine of all these Participial forms is fashioned by appending **ት**: **ከልእት**, **ዳግምት**, **ሣልስት** &c. But, following a formative tendency which is peculiarly active in the construction of Numerals, and perhaps also because the old Participial form had otherwise gone out of use in the tongue, these Adjectives have acquired new forms, brought about by attaching terminations. The Participial form, in fact, attaches to itself either the long ending $\bar{a}w\bar{i}$, Fem. $\bar{a}w\bar{i}t$ (§ 119, b):—**ሣልሳዊ**, **ሣልሳዊት**, or the shorter ending $\bar{a}i$, to which a Fem. $\bar{i}t$ or $\bar{a}w\bar{i}t$ corresponds, in accordance with § 129, b, ζ:—**ሣልሳይ**, **ሣልሲት** or **ሣልሳዊት**. From **ዳግም** also both these forms are contrived, but not from **ከልእ**. In very rare

instances we have the form **ከዕባዊ** from **ከዕብ**. Along with **ቀዳሚ** we have from **ቀዳም** the forms **ቀዳማዊ** and **ቀዳማይ**, but in the Fem. only **ቀዳሚት**. Thus:—

ORDINAL NUMBERS.

1—10.

<i>Masc.</i>			<i>Fem.</i>	
1.	2.	3.	1.	2.
1. ቀዳሚ	ቀዳማዊ	ቀዳማይ	ቀዳሚት	—
2. ዳግም	ዳግማዊ	ዳግማይ	ዳግሚት	ዳግማዊት
3. ሣልስ	ሣልሳዊ	ሣልሳይ	ሣልሲት	ሣልሳዊት
4. ራብዕ	ራብዓዊ	ራብዓይ	ራብዒት	ራብዓዊት
5. ኃምስ	ኃምሳዊ	ኃምሳይ	ኃምሲት	ኃምሳዊት
6. ሳድስ	ሳድሳዊ	ሳድሳይ	ሳድሲት	ሳድሳዊት
7. ሳብዕ	ሳብዓዊ	ሳብዓይ	ሳብዒት	ሳብዓዊት
8. ሳምን	ሳምናዊ	ሳምናይ	ሳምኒት	ሳምናዊት
9. ታስቦ	ታስፋዊ	ታስፋይ	ታስኒት	ታስፋዊት
10. ዓሥር	ዓሥራዊ	ዓሥራይ	ዓሥሪት	ዓሥራዊት

The Cardinal Numbers usually appear for the Ordinals also, in the case of the *Tens*, just as in other Semitic languages (“the thirtieth year” = “the year thirty”):—**አመ : ሠላሳሁ : ለወርኅ** “on the thirtieth of the month”,—(*lit.* ‘at the time of the thirty of the month’) LUDOLF, ‘*Lex.*’ col. 333. But yet there occurs, besides, an Adjective-form in *āwī*: 20, **ዕሥራዊ**; 30, **ሠላሳዊ**; 40, **አርባዓዊ**; 50, **አምሳዊ**; 60, **ስሳዊ**; 70, **ሰባዊ**; 80, **ሰማንያዊ**; 90, **ተስፋዊ**. On the other hand no Adjective-forms are derived from **ምእት** or **አልፍ**.

Number of
the Day of
the Week
or Month.

(b) The Ethiopians have peculiar forms for the days of the week and of the month⁽¹⁾. From a Pass. Part. of the type **ገቡር** a Substantive Noun is derived afresh by the interpolation of an *a* after the first radical (so that if **ገቡር** = قَتُول, then **ገቡር** is = قَاتُول), with the force of a Substantive like *πεντάς, έβδομάς* &c. (*cf.* § 109, 3, *b*)⁽²⁾. Thus, **ሰኑይ**—“the second day (of the week or of the month)”⁽³⁾; **ሠሉስ** “the third”; **ረቡዕ** “the fourth”; **ኅሙስ**

⁽¹⁾ *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’, § 364.

⁽²⁾ *Cf.* EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 152, *c*.

⁽³⁾ Hence too the Fem. **ሰኒት**, while **ሰኒት** (*postera dies*) comes from **ሰንይ**.

“the fifth”; **ሰዱስ** “the sixth”; **ሰባት** “the seventh”; **ሰሙን** “the eighth (day of the month)”; **ተሰብ** “the ninth”; **ዐሠር** “the tenth”. The “first” (day) of the week is **እሐድ** (for **አሐድ**, on account of the Aspirate **ሐ**); the “first” of the month **አሚር** (‘summit’); hence the “eleventh” of the month is **ዐሠር : ወአሚር** Numb. 7, 72; so **ዐሠር : ወረብት** Acts 27, 27; **ዐሠር : ወኅመስ** Lev. 23, 6. These forms make no distinction between genders⁽¹⁾, and may be used quite independently without the word “day” being placed beside them: **በዐሠር : ወረብት** “in 14 days” Hen. 78, 6; or else they may, like other numerals, be connected with the object numbered, by way of co-ordination. They are nearly always used, in place of the other numerals, whenever days, months or hours are numbered, *e. g.* **ነበረ : ህየ : ሰኑየ : መዋዕለ** “he tarried there (‘a two-days’) two days” John 11, 6; **ሠሉስ : ዕለተ : ወሠሉስ : ሌሊት** “three days and three nights” (*lit.* ‘a third day and a third night’) Matt. 12, 40; 15, 32; John 2, 19; Luke 13, 14; John 20, 26; Gen. 7, 4, 10; 8, 10; 24, 55; Ex. 7, 25; 20, 9; Lev. 15, 13; even **መዋዕለ : ፫፻፳፱ ወረብት** “364 days” Hen. 72, 32. In like manner they stand for Numeral Adjectives, when days are enumerated: **አመ : ሰሙን : ዕለት** “on the eighth day” Luke 1, 59; 2, 21; but a complementary Suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. Masc. is usually attached in that case (as with **ኩሉ** &c., § 157): — **አመ : ዐሠሩ : ወረብት : ሌሊት** Acts 27, 27 (Old) (v. also § 191). In rare instances they are employed in enumerating other objects than divisions of Time, Hen. 77, 8⁽²⁾.

(c) To express Numerals in the sense of *Manifoldness* (*Multiplicatives*), Passive Participles of the type **ግብር** may be used. For since verbs even may be derived from the Numbers 1—10, according to § 77, a Passive Participle may also be formed: **ሥሉስ** “threefold, triple”, “triangular”, “triune”; **ርብት** “fourfold”, “quadrangular” &c. For “two” in this application **ክዑብ** “double” is used.

Farther, Substantives of the type **ትግብርት** (§ 111) and **ትግብሪት** and still more commonly of the type **ምግብርት** and **ምግብሪት**⁽³⁾, are derived, to express “Multiplicity” and “the Manifold”

(1) And yet we read in Matt. 27, 46: **ሰዓት : ተሰብት (ተሰዓት)** “the ninth hour”.

(2) [FLEMING here reads **ሰብዑ**, the cardinal numeral, instead of DILLMANN’s ordinal **ሰባት** (*acc.*). TR.]

(3) Being in fact, first of all, Passive Participles of the type **መዝሙር**

(properly, “the product”). Hence: **ትሥልስት** “threefold” and “Trinity”; **ትርብዕት** “fourfold” Luke 19, 8; Ex. 21, 37; **ትጥምስት** “five-fold” Ex. 21, 37; **ትዕሥርት** “ten-fold”; **ትአልፊት** “ten-thousand-fold” = 10,000 (Hen. 21, 6; 40, 1; 71, 8, 13 &c.); or **ምሥልስት** “threefold”; **ምጥምስት** “five-fold” Gen. 43, 34; **ምስብሂት** “seven-fold”, **ምአልፊት** “ten-thousand-fold” Ps. 67, 18. In the Accusative these Substantives are used adverbially (§ 163): **ምሥልስት** “threefold” Deut. 19, 3; **ትርብዕት** “fourfold”; **ምጥምስት** “five-fold”; **ምስብሂት** “seven-fold” Ps. 11, 7; 78, 13; **ትዕሥርት** “ten-fold” Is. 6, 13.

From the number “two” is formed **ካብት** “the double” (‘doubling’) and **ካብት** “twofold” (Adv.), and also from the same root **ምካብት** “doubling” in the general sense of “multiplying”, “multiplied”. This last word may be combined with any number, to express “manifoldness”: **ምእት : ምካብት** “an hundredfold” Gen. 26, 12; Matt. 19, 29; Luke 8, 8; **ካብት : ምካብት** “double” Rev. 18, 6; **ብዙሃ : ምካብት** “manifold” Luke 18, 30; **፯ ምካብት** Hen. 91, 16; **ምካብት : አልፍ : እምአኣላፍ** Rev. 9, 16⁽¹⁾:—even **፯ ምካብት : ትምህርት** Hen. 93, 10.

Simpler expressions are met in **በሥላሳ** “thirtyfold”, **በምእት** “an hundredfold” Mark 4, 20.

Abstract
Numerals.

(d) *Abstract Numeral Substantives* are given in **ሥላሴ** “Trinity”; **ጉማሴ** “the Five”; **ሱባዔ** “the Seven”, “Week” (§ 120, β), also in **ታጥማስ** (§ 111, β).

Numeral
Adverbs.

(e) To express *Numeral Adverbs* in the signification of ‘so and so-many-times’, the Cardinal number of the second Fem. type (§ 158) is put in the Accusative: **ሥልሰ** “thrice” Matt. 26, 34; Hen. 65, 2; **ጥምስ** “five times” 2 Cor. 11, 24; **ስብዕ** “seven times” Gen. 4, 15; or,—and this may be said to be still more frequent,—that form is left entirely uninflected and is used in that guise as an adverb (§ 163): **ስብዕ** “seven times” (of very frequent

(§ 116, γ), or names of things, of the type **መግብር** and **መግበር** (116, β & α), increased next by the Fem. ending **ት** or **ዊት** (§ 120, α), before which **መ** is reduced to **ም**.

(¹) [It is much more likely that **ምካብት** occurs here in its *particular* meaning of “double”, and not in its general sense of “so-many-fold”, for it comes before, instead of after, the other numerals, and it purports to be a translation of *δύο μυριάδες μυριάδων*. ~TR.]

occurrence). For “once”, **ጾዕረ** is employed (مَرَّةً, مَرَّةً) Mark 14, 41; 7, 27; Titus 3, 10; or **በጾዕረ**, although the latter properly means “all at once” Cant. 4, 9; or **አሐተ** (أَحَدًا) Judges 6, 39; 16, 18.— For “twice”, **ከዕበ** Titus 3, 10, or **ከዕበተ**, or **ዳግመ**. For higher as well as for lower numbers a periphrasis may also be employed by means of **ጊዜ** (“time”, “hour”, “turn”): **ሠለስተ፡ ጊዜ** “thrice”; **አርባዕተ፡ ጾአተ፡ ጊዜ** “four hundred times”; or **ሠለስተ፡ ጊዜያተ** “thrice”. **ጊዜ** may also be left out, if the meaning is clear from the context: **ሐብዓ፡ በበ፡ ሐብዕ** “70×7 times” Matt. 18, 22; **ሐብዕተ** “seven times” Josh. 6, 16. Or **ጾከዕቢት** is used (v. *supra* c).

In answer to the question, ‘For which time?’ the Ordinal is given, either in the neuter with the preposition **በ**, e. g. **በሣልስ** “for the third time” Luke 23, 22; **በዳግሞ** “for the second time” Matt. 18, 16 (but also **ከዕበ** Luke 23, 20, or **ዳግመ**); **በሐብዕ** Job 5, 19; also in the Fem. and Acc., e. g. **ራብዕተ** “for the fourth time” Numb. 10, 6;—or as a Personal by way of Apposition to the Person to whom the action is ascribed as repeated for such-and-such a number of times, e. g. “thou strikest me **ናሁ፡ ሣልስከ፡ ዝንቱ** for now the third time” Numb. 22, 28: v. *infra* § 191.

(f) *The part of the whole* (or *Aliquot Fraction*) is usually expressed by **እድ** (ጥ) “hand”, more rarely by **ክፍል** “division” Fractional Numbers. Hen. 78, 4, with the Ordinal number in Masc. or Fem. form:—**ራብዕት፡ እድሃ፡ ለምድር** “the fourth part of the earth”; **ሐብዓይ፡ እድ** Hen. 73, 3; **ሐብዒት፡ እድ** 73, 5; **ኃምስተ፡ እድሁ** (Acc.) Lev. 5, 16; Gen. 47, 24, 26; **ዓሥርተ፡ እድ** Lev. 6, 13. But the Ordinal is often put in the Constr. State:—**ራብዕተ፡ እድ** “the fourth, as to the part”=“the fourth part”, e. g. Rev. 6, 8; v. also § 191; thus **ዓሥራተ⁽¹⁾፡ እድ** “a tenth part” Gen. 14, 20; 28, 22; Matt. 23, 23. “Two parts” are also given as **ጾከዕቢት** Deut. 21, 17. *Fractional Numbers* are e. g. **፫ ትጥምስት** “three-fifths” Hen. 78, 7; **በበ፡ ፯፯ እድ** “by sevenths” Hen. 74, 3. [Cf. also Hen. 73, 6—8].

(g) To express the idea “so many each” (*Distributives*) in numbers, Ethiopic has no special formation. Repetition of the numeral, first of all, does duty instead, at least in the case of uncompounded numerals: **አሐዱ፡ አሐዱ፡ አሐቲ፡ አሐቲ** “*singuli*,
Distributives.

(¹) V. on this word *supra*, p. 259 Note(¹).

singulae” Hen. 72, 1, 3; 7, 1; 89, 59; Gen. 40, 5⁽¹⁾; **ክልኤ : ክልኤ** Gen. 7, 9; 15, 2, 3; **ሰባዕተ : ሰባዕተ** (*acc.*) Gen. 7, 2, 3⁽²⁾. When this is not practicable, or is regarded as too prolix, the Prefix-Particles **በ**, **ለ**, **ዘ** are employed in a double form, as **በበ**, **ለለ**, **ዘዘ**. Of these forms **ዘዘ** may be used only when a Genitive relation, or a Relative clause is already present in the case, *e. g.* **ነሥኦ : ውእቱ : ብእሲ : አዕነ-ገ : ዘወርቅ : ዘዘ : ሕልቅ : ድልወቱ : ወአውቃፈ : ለእደዊሃ : ዘዘ : ዐሥሩ : ሕልቅ : ድልወቱ** “the man took ear-rings of gold, each an ounce in weight, and bracelets for her hands, each ten ounces in weight” Gen. 24, 22; *cf.* also Gen. 34, 25; 37, 7; 43, 21. So too, when the prepositions **በ** and **ለ** would have been used, even had there been no distributive meaning, the double form of these is obviously the proper form to express the distributive “each”: **በበ : ዲናር : ለዕለት** “for a penny each a-day” Matt. 20, 2; Hen. 34, 2; **ለለ : ፩** “to every one” Matt. 25, 15; Hen. 7, 1; Judges 11, 40⁽³⁾. But these last two prepositions, **በ** and **ለ**, may also be placed, in the double form, before any other word in the sentence, —be it Subject or Object, or in any other reference,—for the purpose of expressing *ἀνὰ, κατὰ*: —**ወነሥኦ : በበ : ዲናር** “and they received *ἀνὰ ὀγδάρσιον* or a penny each” Matt. 20, 9, 10; **ወወሀቦሙ : ዐራዘ : በበ : ክልኤቱ** “and he gave them each two vestments” (*literally*: “garments by the pair”) Gen. 45, 22; **ንነሥኦ : በበ : ዐሠርቱ : ዕደው : ለለ : ምእት** “we will take (‘by way of ten

(¹) [That **አሐዱ : አሐዱ** (**፩፩**) may also be employed in the sense of “some” or “a few” is shown by a passage in ‘*Le Livre des Mystères du Ciel et de la Terre*’ (ed. PERRUCHON), p. 18, l. 14; *cf.* PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVIII, p. 488.]

(²) Other words too are repeated in like manner to express “*singuli*” **ብእሲ : ብእሲ** “*virī singuli*”, “every man” Judges 8, 24; 17, 6; **ነግሀ : ነግሀ** “every morning” Ex. 36, 3; 2 Kings 13, 4; **ኅበ : ኅበ** “more and more” 2 Kings 3, 1; **ከመ : ከመ** LUDOLF, ‘*Lex.*’ col. 397; **ክምረ : ክምረ** Ex. 8, 10.

(³) In older Manuscripts **ለለለ** is also met with, instead of **ለለ**, which is to be judged of in accordance with § 140 *sub fin.*; *e. g.* instead of **ለለ : ፩** “to every man”, we meet with **ለለለ : ፩**, whereby **፩** is raised to the Plural, Gen. 42, 25 Note, 47, 12 Note, 49, 28 Note. We farther come upon the expression “twelve princes **ለለለ** (instead of **ለለ** :) **ሕዘቢሆሙ** for their several tribes” Gen. 25, 16, in which the Collective **ሕዘ** “their tribe” is raised by **ለለ** to a new Plural with a distributive force.

men') ten men out of every hundred" Judges 20, 10; **פּוֹאֵל : פּוֹאֵל : הֵ**
 "they begin to say one by one" Matt. 26, 22; **הָאֵל : הֵאֵל : הֵאֵל**
פּוֹאֵל ('whose maladies were—so to speak—*κατ' ἰδίαν*') "each of
 whom had his own special disease" Matt. 4, 24 &c.

(h) To express the ideas *πρῶτον*, *δεύτερον*, *τρίτον* ("in the first, second or third place") we find **הָאֵל : הָאֵל : הָאֵל** Sir. 23, 23 (the Subj. is Fem. gen.).

Expressions
for *πρῶτον*,
δεύτερον,
τρίτον.

FORMATION OF WORDS OF RELATION.

Under this title Adverbs, Prepositions and Conjunctions fall to be specially dealt with.

I. ADVERBS.

1. ADVERBS DERIVED FROM PRONOMINAL ROOTS.

§ 160. 1. *Adverbs of Demonstrative meaning.*

(a) The most general particle in this class had originally the form of **הָ**, **הָ** (§ 62) "there!" "see there!" as if pointing to an object. It no longer, however, occurs in this short form, but only as a Compound. 1. It may be compounded with the *a* (*hā*) of direction (§ 143), as **הָאֵל** (Ps. 79, 3; Gen. 4, 8 Note; Herm. 82 *a*, 13); **הָאֵל** 4 Esr. 3, 26 (KÖNIG, p. 136); **הָאֵל** Mark 10, 21 (Rom. ed.); or, usually, **הָאֵל** = "hither", "come", always employed by way of summons or incentive, corresponding to *δεῦρο* or *ἔρχου* Matt. 19, 21; 8, 9; 9, 18; 14, 28 and equivalent to "come now!" "up!" *e. g.* Rev. 6, 1⁽¹⁾. As it is always used by way of command or summons, it is conjugated just like an Imperative⁽²⁾,—in particular, taking the 2nd pers. fem. sing., **הָאֵל** (Gen. 19, 32; John 4, 16), as well as the 2nd pers. pl. masc., **הָאֵל** (Matt. 11, 28; 21, 38; Ps. 94, 1; Judges 16, 18), and fem. **הָאֵל** (and **הָאֵל** Matt. 28, 6). A verb usually appears along with it, *e. g.* Gen. 11, 4; yet **הָאֵל** even by itself yields complete sense: **הָאֵל : הָאֵל** "and hither to me!" (*i. e.* "come ye to me!") Gen. 45, 18. 2. It may also be compounded with *Suffix Pronouns in the Acc.-subordination* (*i. e.* as Verbal Suffixes).

1. Adverbs
of Demon-
strative
meaning:—
Particles
of Demon-
strative
force.

(1) Cf. also TRUMPP, p. 559, and 'Sitzber. d. k. bayer. Ak. d. W.' 1877, p. 119 sqq.

(2) Cf. in Hebrew—EWALD, 'Hebr. Spr.' § 101, c.

With the suffix, however, of the 1st pers. sing. the form is not **ከኔ** but **ከየ** (doubtless to avoid in this case repetition of the *n*) = “there I am!” or “here I am!” *i. e.* “see! I am here!” Matt. 8, 7; Acts 9, 10; Hebr. 10, 7; Ps. 39, 10; or **ከየ** is even combined with a repetition of the pronoun **ከኔ** “I”, as in **ከየ : ከኔ** Gen. 22, 1, 11; 27, 18. It appears also with the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. as **ኖህ**⁽¹⁾ (having the *a* lengthened by the tone and the aspirate) “there he is!” or “there it is!”, and, generally, “behold!” *e. g.* Ps. 7, 15; Gen. 19, 8; Matt. 10, 16; 15, 22. The suffixes **የ**, **ሆሙ**, **ሆን** it takes, in their truncated form, *ā*, *ōmū*, *ōn*; but then, in accordance with § 41, it lets a separating semivowel be heard between itself and them, thus **ከየ** “behold her!” John 19, 27; Luke 19, 20; Gen. 12, 19, or **ከየ**. Usually however **ከየ** has a neuter sense and is thus equivalent to **ኖህ** “behold!” John 19, 5, 26; Luke 17, 21, 23; Matt. 11, 19; 24, 23, 26; Ps. 51, 6; farther **ከየሙ** “behold them!” Mark 3, 32, 34; Acts 5, 25; and **ከየን** “behold them (*f.*)!” Gen. 19, 8. It is not in use with the suffixes of the 1st pers. Plur. or 2nd pers. Plur.

Another particle⁽²⁾, which is used like **ከየ** in the sense “there!”, is **ከን** (ከ, ከከ), from the same root as the foregoing, but with the pronunciation *an* (§ 62) or *ən*; whence **ከንከሙ** “there! you!” = *λαβέτε* Matt. 26, 26, also by way of incentive or summons like **ከየ**.

There are, besides, several other short enclitic particles of indication, from the same stem. The particle **ከ**, which hitherto has only been met with as an affix to the preposition and conjunction **ከስከ** “till”, expresses direction, **ከስከን** “as far as—”:—**ከስከን : ዐረብ** “as far as the west” Ps. 49, 2; 112, 3; Malachi 1, 11; **ከምስብኦ : ከስከን : ከንስሳ** Ex. 13, 2; **ከስከን : ኅብ : ዐጽመ : መንከስ** Judges 15, 14; **ከስከን : ርኢከዎሙ** Hen. 89, 5, 8, 75. It is perhaps merely a shortened form from the fuller **ከ**, which still occurs with the Accusative of direction: **ወስተ : ከሐተኔ** “to one place”, or (John 11, 52) **ከሐተኔ** alone, “in one”, “into one place” (v. LUDOLF, ‘*Lex.*’ col. 332)⁽³⁾. Corresponding in meaning to this **ከ**, but formed from another root (§ 62), is **ከ** “there”, “here”, in use still as an

(1) Hence the Amharic **ኖህ** “he is”.

(2) On the other hand **ከኒ** *βᾶδιζε* Ex. 4, 19 is scarcely in this class.

(3) In the view of PRAETORIUS, ‘*Amh. Spr.*’ p. 197 this **ከ** or **ከ** is considered to have become the ordinary Accusative-sign in Amharic.

affix to **ተል** “universality”: **ተልሂ** “everywhere”, but Accusative **ተለሂ** “in every direction”; **በተልሂ** “everywhere” Ex. 40, 32; **እምተልሂ** “from every quarter” Mark 1, 45; **እምተለሂ**, with the same meaning, Hen. 28, 2. And just as the form **ኀ** alternated with **ኃ**, so was it also at one time with the forms **ሃ** and **ሄ**, *cf.* §§ 143 and 163.

(b) *Independent Adverbs of Place and Time.* To this Independent class belong, in the first place, **ሀየ**⁽¹⁾, “there”, “thither”, and **ዝየ**^{Adverbs of Place and Time.} “here”, “hither”. These two particles in this form have probably come from **ሂ** and **ዜ** (*cf.* what is given under (a); *cf.* also *infra* **ዜ** in **ይእዚ**). Examples:—**ዝየ** “here” Matt. 14, 17; 26, 36; “hither” Matt. 8, 29; 14, 18; **ሀየ** “there” Mark 11, 5; “thither” Rom. 15, 24. Both of them are also compounded with prepositions:—**በሀየ** Matt. 13, 42; **በዝየ** Matt. 17, 4; **እምሀየ** “thence” Matt. 11, 1, also of time Hen. 38, 6; **እምዝየ**; **እስከ : ሀየ** &c. To point to what is more remote, the language has a derivative from **ከ**, formed with the **ሃ** of direction, which is here hardened into **ሐ** (§ 62), **ከሐ** and **ከሓ** “to yonder place” Matt. 26, 36; Numb. 17, 2; or with prepositions: **ኀበ : ከሐ** “to yonder place” Matt. 17, 20; also **በከሐ** “in yonder place” Heb. 7, 8; **እምከሐ** Josh. 8, 22. Besides, from **ከሐ** “to yonder place” a word for “in yonder place” or “there” may be formed by appending **ከ** a second time, **ከሐከ** “there” Luke 17, 21, 23; Matt. 24, 23; Gen. 19, 9; whence **በዝየኒ : ወበከሐከኒ** “here and there”; also in the sense of *ultra*, *supra*, v. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’, col. 823. **ይእዚ** is treated as an Adverb of Time, “just now”, “now”. It is a compound of **ይእ** (§ 65) and an adverb **ዜ**⁽²⁾, which certainly at one time referred to Place, and was merely transferred to Time. It is in very frequent use, compounded also with prepositions: **እምይእዚ** “from this time forward”; **እስከ : ይእዚ** “till now”. Meanwhile it is employed not merely for the Time which is present to the speaker, but for a present Time in the future or in the past, like the Hebrew **הנה**, *e. g.* Hen. 38, 4; 50, 5. Other Adverbs of Time must be expressed by periphrasis: “thereafter” **እምዝ**, **እምኒሃ**, **እምኒሁ** (Hen. 83, 10; 89, 19), **እምድኅረ : ዝንቱ**

(1) [In older MSS. **ሂየ**; v. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’ col. 13; *cf.* also *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.*, p. XVI.]

(2) Formed from the $\sqrt{\text{ከ}}$, like **ሂ** and **ኃ**. With respect to the termination, all three may be compared with the Hebrew **הנה**, **הנה**, **הנה**.

and the like; “at that time” **አሚሃ, ይእተ፡ ጊዜ, በውእቱ፡ መዋዕል** &c.

§ 161. 2. *Interrogative Adverbs and Adverbs of Relative Meaning.*

(a) *Interrogative Adverbs.*

2. Inter-
rogative
Adverbs
and
Adverbs of
Relative
meaning:—
(a) Inter-
rogative
Adverbs.

Ethiopic has no introductory particles⁽¹⁾, such as other Semitic tongues have, to mark a sentence generally as an interrogative one, and thus introduce a question in the absence of a more definite interrogative Adverb.—It has only a few short particles, in particular **ኑ** and **ሁ**, which are appended to some word in the Interrogative sentence, like, for instance, *ne* in Latin. On the degree of difference between these two, compare § 198. They seem originally to mean “it”, in the sense of “it (is the case)”⁽²⁾; and they have gained their interrogative force through their enclitic position conjoined with the tone:—**ተአምኑሁ** Matt. 9, 28 “you believe;—(is) *that* (the case)?” = “do ye believe?” **አንተኑ፡ ዘይመጽእ** Matt. 11, 3 “thou art he that should come;—(is) *that* (the case)?” or “(is it) so?” = “art thou he that should come?” (On the use of these Interrogative particles in certain Conditional Clauses, *e. g.* **ሶበሁ፡ ረሳዕነ፡ ስሞ፡ ለአምላክነ** “if we had forgotten the name of our God” &c. Ps. 43, 22, v. § 205). The particle **ኑ** is often attached also to fuller and more definite Interrogatives, like **ምንት, አይቲ, እፎ** &c. If **ኑ** comes in contact with the vowelless **ን** of a Verb, only one **ን** is written:—**ታማስኑ** “wilt thou destroy?” Gen. 18, 28; on the other hand, in the case of the Noun we have **ዳኅንኑ** “is he well?” Gen. 29, 6, because it has to be pronounced *dāhnēnū*⁽³⁾. For the alternative interrogation, Ethiopic has **ወሚመ**, literally “and what perhaps?” *i. e.* “or?”, compounded of **ሚ** and **መ** (§ 63). For the dependent interrogation, **እመ** is employed, properly “if”, and then “whether”. On this word *cf.* § 198.

(1) Like **ኑ**, **ሁ**.

(2) One is greatly tempted, of course, to put **ኑ** in the same class as **ን** and *ne* and *num*. But as **ሁ** (from **ቱ** § 62) is manifestly formed in the very same way, and can mean nothing but “it” and, farther, as **ቢ** “it is” is very often used to introduce a question (§ 198), it is more advisable to explain **ኑ** in this way too; and all the more, that **ኑ, ን; ኑ, ን; ኑ, ን** correspond to one another throughout, in formation and in meaning.

(3) But v. TRUMPF, p. 559, and *cf.* KÖNIG, p. 96.

Interrogative Adverbs of more definite force are: (1). **አይቲ** “where?” and “whither?” (the latter sense occurring, for example, in Gen. 37, 30 and in Hen. 102, 1), employed both in dependent and in independent interrogation, and formed from the Interrogative **አይ**, which converts Demonstratives into Interrogatives, and **ቲ** “here”⁽¹⁾; often combined farther with **ኑ**, **አይቲኑ** “where?” “whither?”. Combined with prepositions:—**በአይቲ** “where?” (Matt. 2, 4; Judges 20, 3); also “in what way?” Matt. 9, 15; 12, 34; **እምአይቲ** “whence?” Matt. 21, 25; Hen. 41, 5; Gen. 29, 4; **ኅበ አይቲ** “whither”; **እስከ አይቲ** “to what point?”. **አይቲ** is also used indefinitely in Negative sentences, either with or without **ሂ** or **ኒ** in the sense of “anywhere”, 3 Kings 3, 36; 10, 12; 4 Kings 5, 25.— (2). **ማእዚ** “when?”, formed from **እዚ**, **ይእዚ** by means of **መ** (§ 63), and often strengthened also by **ኑ**;—**እማእዚ** “how long since” (“*a quo tempore?*”), **እስከ ማእዚ** “till when?” “how long?” (Ps. 12, 1—3; Josh. 18, 3; Matt. 17, 17); **ለማእዚ** “for what time?” 1 Peter 1, 11. (3). **እፎ** “how?” formed from **እ(አይ)**, § 63, *b* and **ፎ** “here”, “thus”, § 64, *b*. It may be strengthened by **ኑ**, and may be compounded with **በ**, **በእፎ** “in what way?” Mark 2, 18, and it is very often used in dependent interrogation, as well as in the exclamation—“What!” Hen. 21, 8. Frequently it exhibits a conception somewhat more distinctly coloured, *e. g.* **ጽልመትከ እፎ** “how great must thy darkness be!” Matt. 6, 23; 1 John 3, 1; **እፎ ፈድፋድ** “how much more!” Matt. 6, 30; 7, 11; 10, 25. Instead of plain **እፎ**,—**እፎፎ**, **እፋፎ**, **እፈፎ** and **እፈእፎ** are also met with, particularly in Cyrillus Alexandrinus; v. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 807. (4). In Ethiopic one uses for the interrogative “why?” **ምንት** or **ምንትኑ** “what?”, *e. g.* Hen. 83, 6; Gen. 40, 7; or more frequently the same word in the Accusative **ምንተ**, **ምንተኑ** Gen. 26, 27; Matt. 7, 3; or **ለምንት** “wherefore?” Ps. 2, 1; or **በእንተ ፡ ምንት** “for what reason?” Matt. 17, 19; while **በምንት** means “in what way?” Ps. 118, 9. Or “why?” may be indicated by means of turns like **ምንት ፡ አሥሐቃ** “what has made her laugh?” *i. e.* “why does she laugh?” Gen. 18, 13; 24, 31; Matt. 20, 6; Judges 18, 8.

⁽¹⁾ The original form for **ሂ**, allied to **ዚ**, preserved in **ሂጥ**, **ሂጥጥ**, **ሂጥጥጥ**.—Notice **አይቲ** with **እም** following = **أَيْنَ** in sentences like **أَيْنَ هَذَا مِنْ ذَاكَ** “what is this to that?” G. A. 7, 5, 6^{bis}, 7, 8, 9, 14.

(b) Relative
Adverbs.

(b) *Relative Adverbs*. For the meaning “where” **ገበ** is usually employed, formed from **ገ** (hardened out of **ሀ**, § 62, 1, b) and the Preposition **በ**, here set last⁽¹⁾; originally demonstrative “in—there”, and the Compound is a Preposition in very frequent use in this sense (§ 165); but it has also become relative: “in—where”, “where”, and “where to”, *e. g.* **ገበ : ሀሎኩ : አነ : ሀየ : ይሄሉ : ዘይትለአከኔ** John 12, 26; Matt. 8, 19, 20; 13, 50; Ps. 83, 3 &c. Farther, in the relative clause which it introduces, **ሀየ** may be placed in addition to it, but yet separated from it by a word or two⁽²⁾:—**ገበ : ሀለዉ : ሀየ** “wherein they were” Hen. 17, 1⁽³⁾; Gen. 13, 4; Josh. 22, 19 &c. **ገበ** is also compounded with prepositions: **በገበ** “there, where” or simply “where” Matt. 13, 57; Josh. 8, 24; Hen. 12, 1; 33, 2; “wheresoever” Matt. 26, 13; **አንተ : ገበ** “wheresoever” Hen. 16, 1; **አምገበ** “whence” Hen. 41, 3; Matt. 12, 44. For “when” **አመ** is used (§ 64, 3, b), *e. g.* John 4, 21; **ለአመ** “till” Zeph. 3, 8. Still, **አመ** is employed rather as a Conjunction or a Preposition (*v. infra*). Besides, the mere relative **ዘ**, referring to a fore-mentioned word expressing time, is quite sufficient to express “when” (*v.* § 202, 3). The conception “how”, “as” or “like” is expressed by **ከመ**, but it is always either Preposition or Conjunction.

§ 162. 3. *Negative, Affirmative, Exclamatory, and Restrictive Particles, and some Enclitics of the most general meaning.*

3. Negative,
Affirmative,
Exclama-
tory and
Restrictive
Particles,
together
with certain
Enclitics.

The ordinary particle which serves to *negative* either a single word or an entire clause, is **ኢ**, § 62, c. It is always prefixed to some other word, and in fact to that word which has to be negatived first or specially; and in such a combination it occasionally exercises an influence upon an initial **አ** (§ 48, 6)⁽⁴⁾. Stronger and more independent negations are conveyed by **አኮ** (§ 64, b) “in no wise”, “not”, and by **አልቦ**,—on which last compare §§ 167 and 197,—mostly corresponding in conception to the Hebrew **אין** and the Arabic **لَيْسَ**, seeing that it signifies first of all: “it is not”, “there is not”. It is used also for “no” Matt. 5, 37; 13, 29; Ex. 10, 25 &c. The word **አንብዩ**, a compound of **አን** (= **אין**),

⁽¹⁾ [V., however, PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVII, p. 272.]

⁽²⁾ **እ-ሀየ-ሀየ**.

⁽³⁾ [FLEMMING's reading is **ገበ : አለ : ሀለዉ : ሀየ**. TR.]

⁽⁴⁾ The accent of the word which is connected with **ኢ**, remains unaffected by it: TRUMPP, p. 559.

§ 62, *c* and **ብየ** “with me” (§ 167), literally “not with me (is it)”,— signifies “I am not in the position”, “I am not allowed”, “I am not able”. It is with this word that one declines to accede to a request: Jas. 4, 7; Matt. 21, 29. There is an older form **እንቢ** (§ 167). Cf. also **እንብከ**, **እንቢከ** and **እንቢከሙ**.

As an Affirmative we have **አወ** ⁽¹⁾ “yes”, “of course”, “certainly” Matt. 5, 37. With **አሆ** “Oh! yes” consent is announced to a summons, so that it is the contrary expression to **እንብየ**:— Judges 6, 13, 15, 22; Matt. 21, 29, 30; 27, 20; Rom. 3, 26; Jas. 3, 3; 4, 7; 5, 6. As to its origin, v. § 62, *b* ⁽²⁾. To beseech any one, the particle **ሐ** “now!” “I pray” is made use of, attached as an enclitic to the Imperative: **ተመዩኑሐ** “turn, I pray thee” Ps. 79, 15; **አድኅንሐ** “save, I beseech thee” ⁽³⁾ Ps. 117, 24. It comes from the demonstrative root **ሐ** (§ 62, 1, *a*); and, being no doubt originally a mere form of pointing out something “there!”, it has thence been used to direct the attention of the person who is entreated, to some object or circumstance. The same meaning is given more emphatically by **እስኩ** “O now!” (§ 64, *b*) ⁽⁴⁾, of independent force it is true, but yet placed after the Imperative: Acts 22, 27; Gen. 24, 23. For “yes indeed!” “certainly!” “it is so!” **ኃ** is also used: Isaiah 14, 10; Phlx. 3 ⁽⁵⁾.

An exclamation of joy or mockery is found in **እንቋፅ** “ha!” (§ 63, *c*) Ps. 34, 24; 39, 21; 69, 4; Job 39, 25.

Of restrictive force is **ከመ** (§ 64, *b*), regularly put last, which means first “thus”, then “like what” (**ከኞኝ** indef.), and thence 1. “nearly” Gen. 32, 32; Gen. 39, 10 (where it is put first for a special reason); 2. “nothing other than”, or “just”, “merely”: **ወስተ : ከርሥ : ከመ** “merely into the belly” Mark 7, 19; **አኮ : በኅብስት : ከመ** “not by bread alone” Matt. 4, 4; 5, 47; 21, 21; Ps. 61, 9. It is therefore specially used with Pronouns, to express the notion of “just” (*idem*), § 150, *c*.

⁽¹⁾ Probably abbreviated considerably from an older type. I refer it provisionally to **ሐ**, **ኢ**, **ከ**, **ከኞኝ**, **ከኞኝ**.

⁽²⁾ Yet it might also have sprung from *u-hu*, *hu-hu*, “that it is”, “thus it is”.

⁽³⁾ Thus like **ከ** and the Arabic *Modus Energeticus*.

⁽⁴⁾ I do not think that this comes from **ሐከወ** = **ሐከየ**, as this word does not mean “to beg”.

⁽⁵⁾ [*i. e.* Philexius, *Quaestio* 3. TR.]

በሰንበት : ገቢረ : ሠናይ “it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day” Matt. 12, 12; 12, 10; Deut. 22, 19; **ኢይትዐጸብከ : ፈንዎቶ** “let it not seem hard to thee (§ 178) to let him go free” Deut. 15, 18; **እመ : ኢይትከሀል : ዝኅሊፈ** “if it is not possible that this pass away” Matt. 26, 42; **ኢኮነ : ሠናየ : ነሢኦ : ኅብስተ : ውሉድ : ወውረበ : ለከለባት** “it is not proper to take the children’s bread and to give it to the dogs” Matt. 15, 26; **ይቀልል : በአተ : (§ 124, beginning) ገመል : እንተ : ስቀረተ : መርፍእ : እምባዕል : በዊኦ : መንግሥተ : እግዚአብሔር** “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God” Matt. 19, 24 (*cf.* 9, 5); **ኮነክመ : ዐዊዶቶ : ለዝንቱ : ደብር** (“there has been for you enough of the compassing of this mountain”) “you have compassed this mountain long enough” Deut. 2, 3⁽¹⁾. Such unions are explained most readily by the consideration that in thought the impersonal turn of the Verb is replaced by a personal one (*e. g.* “it is lawful” is thought of as “we may” or “one may”). Meanwhile, this construction is not absolutely necessary: the complement may be applied to such verbs in the Subject- or Nominative-case, and then they cease to be impersonal: **ሊተ : ይኔይሰኒ : መዊት** “it is better for me to die” 1 Cor. 9, 15; **አሉ : ቀዳሚ : ይኔይስ : ብሂል** Hen. 37, 3; **የዐጽባ : ወሊድ** “it becomes hard for her to bring to the birth” Hen. 62, 4; **አከለክመ : በሊዕ** “it is sufficient for you,—to eat” Hen. 102, 9 (*cf.* Hebr. 9, 27; 10, 31). In the case of Infinitives in *ō* it is impossible to discern which of the two constructions they are following, *e. g.* in **አኮ : ሠናይ : አውስቦ** “then it is not good to marry” Matt. 19, 10, inasmuch as **አውስቦ** may be Nominative as well as Accusative.

On the Accusative with the Infinitive after Verbs of *Saying* and *Perceiving*, v. § 190.

(β) When this, the most obvious form of union, is not found practicable, a Conjunction like **ከመ**, **ዘ**, **እስመ** or other similar form, is employed, *e. g.* “he said, *that* &c.”; *cf.* § 203.

(b) If the verb to be subordinated is related to the principal verb,—rather *as the intended result* or *the aim*—, it takes the following forms.

(¹) An instance in which **ሀሎ** is first construed with the Subjunctive, and afterwards with the Accusative of the Infinitive, is met with in Sap. 16, 28 A.

to discern in it a faded form of **ሃ** “it” or “thus”, in the sense of **ከ** “so”⁽¹⁾.

2. ADVERBS DERIVED FROM CONCEPTIONAL WORDS.

§ 163. 1. The greater number of words which are used adverbially are originally nouns; and only a very few spring directly from the verb. Every noun, when subordinated in the Accusative to the verb of a clause, may limit and determine that verb after the fashion of an Adverb (§ 174). Thus the *Accusative* is precisely the proper Case, with which to form Adverbs. And in fact such formation has been brought about with the Adjective, as well as with the Substantive; for, seeing that every Adjective may easily be conceived of as Neuter,—thereby coming to resemble a Substantive in meaning—, it may, when put in the Accusative under such a conception, become an Adverb also. Besides, several Conceptional words continue in use in the language, only in the form of this adverbial Accusative; and it is such words especially which fall to be described in this place.

1. Adverbs of Place and Time (Acc. of Noun); of Kind and Manner (Acc. of Adj.); and Adverbs formed by prefixing Prepositions to Substantives or Adjectives, instead of taking Acc.

Qualifications of Place and Time, or Nouns which are used in the Accusative of Place and of Time, are, *e. g.*, the following words, originally Substantives:—**ለፊ** “side” (*e. g.* **ኢለፊ : ወኢለፊ** “neither this way nor that way” Josh. 8, 20; Ex. 2, 12); **መልዕልተ** “above” and “upward”; **ቀልቀሊተ** “downward”; **ማእከለ** “in the midst” (Mark 3, 3); **መተከተ** “below”; **ከዋለ** “behind”; **ዐውደ** “around”; **ማዕድተ** “beyond”; **ይምነ** “on the right hand”; **ዕግመ** “on the left hand”; **ደቡብ** “northward”; **ደኅረ** “behind” and “afterward” (Matt. 25, 11); **ደኅሪተ** “backward”, “back”; **ፍጽመ** “in front” (Numb. 1, 53; 32, 17; Deut. 20, 4; Josh. 6, 9; Ps. 45, 5); **ውስጠ** “in”, “within”; **ግድመ** “awry”, “across”; **ሌሊተ** “by night”; **መዐልተ** “by day” and “to-day” (Gen. 43, 16, 25); **ሰርከ** “in the evening”; **ቅድመ** “in front”, “eastward” (Gen. 2, 8), “first”, “before” (Matt. 13, 30; 17, 10); **ኅፊረ** “this year” (Luke 13, 8); **ነግሠ** “early in the morning”; **ዘልፈ** and **ወትረ** “continually”; **ጌሠመ** “to-morrow”; and words originally Adjectives:—**ልዑለ**

⁽¹⁾ [For another explanation of this **ከ** v. BEZOLD, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ XV, p. 398.—It also appears to have been employed merely to indicate that the thoughts of another person are being introduced by the speaker or writer; v. *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.*, p. XX.]

“high”, “upward”; **ታሕትዮ** “under” (Josh. 16, 3; 18, 13, Note); **ነዊህ** or **ነዋህ** “far”, “far away” (Matt. 15, 8; Mark 7, 6); **ርሐቀ** “far distant”; **ውቱረ** “entirely” (Heb. 9, 4); **ዝሉፈ** “continually” (Ex. 21, 6); **ክሡተ** *φανερώς*; **ጉንዱዩ** “a long time”, “some time”. The following are retained in use only in this adverbial Accusative:—**ላዕለ** “above” (chiefly as a preposition, v. *infra*); **ታሕተ** “below”, “down” Matt. 4, 6 (but chiefly as a preposition).

Qualifications of Size or Measure comprehend the Numeral Adverbs (§ 159, e): **ካዕበተ** and **ምካዕቢተ** “repeatedly”; **ክዑብ** “doubly” (‘the second time’); **ካዕበ** and **ዳግመ** “again”; **መጠነ** and **አምጣነ** (‘the bigness of—’) “as large as”; **ሚመጠነ** and **ሚመጠን** “how greatly” (Job 35, 5); **ፈድፋዶ** “very”, “exceedingly”, “specially”, “above all” (even as Predicate); **ስፍነ** “how often?”; v. *supra* § 157, 1.

Qualifications of Kind and Manner are nearly always formed from Adjectives, e. g. **መሪረ** “bitterly”; **ሠናዩ** (as well as **ሠናይ**) “finely”, “well”; **እኩዩ** “badly”, “ill”, **ጽኑዐ** “strongly”, “powerfully”; **ፍጹመ** “perfectly”, “entirely”; **ዐቢዩ** “highly”; **ጥዩቀ** and **ጥንቁቀ** “exactly”; **ጽፉቀ** “frequently”; **ብዙህ** “much”, “often”; **ኅቡረ** “all together”, “together”; **ድሩገ** “at the same time”; **ድመረ** “jointly”; **ትሑተ** “humbly”, “modestly”; **ጽሩዐ** “idly”; **ርቱዐ** “rightly”, and “directly opposite” (Hen. 72, 8), “correctly” (*Chrest.* p. 76, line 14); **ኅዳጠ** “little”; **ፍጡነ** “quickly”, “suddenly”; **ድንጉፀ** : **ወፍጡነ** *φρικτῶς καὶ ταχέως* Sap. 6, 5; **ኅዩለ** *κραταιῶς* Sap. 6, 8; **አዳመ** *εὐμενῶς* Sap. 6, 16; **ንጹሐ** *σωφρόνως* Sap. 9, 11; **ህልወ** “in reality”, and many others.—*Cf.* also **እመ** : **ዳኅነ** : **አቶ ክሙ** Tob. 5, 15. But the following forms, derived from Substantives, are of very frequent occurrence, being mainly retained in use as Adverbs only: **ሕቀ** “by degrees”, “a little”; **ስንአ** “unanimously”; **በከ** “in vain” (**በከ** “emptiness”); **መትልወ** “in succession”, “forthwith”; **ንስቲተ** “a little”, “gradually”; **ደርገ** “together”, “at the same time”; **ግብተ** “suddenly”; **ጽሚተ** (**ጽምሚተ**) “secretly”; and with especial frequency **ጥቀ** properly “exactly”, then commonly “very”, “even”, farther “precisely”, “certainly”; **ጥቀ** : **ኢ** “not even” (*ne quidem*)⁽¹⁾.

(1) A remarkable intensive-form is found in Ps. 44, 2, viz. **ጠበጠበ** “most skilfully” (“dexterously”), from an intensive Adjective **ጠበጠብ**, derived in accordance with § 112, b, from the $\sqrt{\text{ጠበበ}}$ “to be wise”.

But *by means of the preposition በ* (§ 164) the language attains the same object as through the agency of the Accusative. By prefixing this preposition to a Substantive or Adjective, Adverbs of Kind and Manner may be formed: **በጽባሕ** “in the morning”; **በጸጋ** “for nothing” (Matt. 10, 8); **በፍጹሜ** “lastly”, “at last”; **በጽርእ** “in Greek” (Luke 23, 38); **በግዕዝ** “in Ethiopic”; **በሐሰት** “falsely” (Matt. 5, 33); **በትዕቢት** “proudly”; **በጽሚት** “in secret”; **በፈቃድ** “voluntarily” (with Suffix); **በኩርህ** “by constraint” (*invito animo*): **በሠናይ** “in a friendly way” (Gen. 26, 29); **በሕሠ-ም** “miserably” (Matt. 21, 41); **በንጹሕ** “innocently” (Gen. 20, 6); **በኅቡእ** “in secret”; **በዳኅን** “in safety” (Gen. 26, 31); **በኩሉ** &c. In words which convey the notion of “gradually”, **በ** is doubled (*cf.* § 159, *g*): **በበ ንስቲት**, **በበሕቅ**. Other Prepositions also are employed to express Adverbial notions, such as: **ለዓለም** “for ever”; **ኅበ : ካልእ** (‘to another side’) “elsewhere”; **እምትካት** “once” and “long ago” (‘from of old’). Thus **እም** is prefixed, over and above, to **ድኅረ** “afterward”, making **እምድኅረ** “after that” (Matt. 21, 32).

2. A certain number of Adverbial qualifications also are expressed by means of other forms. A Noun may be set in the sentence adverbially, without inflection and otherwise lifeless, in the very form in which it issues from the Stem-forming process; but, save for the Numeral Adverbs (§ 159, *e*), this takes place only in a very few words, which have become entirely or almost entirely obsolete in any other use: **ዮ-ም** “to-day” (“day”); **ትካት** “once” (“antiquity”) Eph. 5, 8; **አማን** “truly”, “certainly”⁽¹⁾; **ቀዳሚ** “in the first place”, “at first” (occurring often; but also the Acc. **ቀዳሚ**, though rarely)⁽²⁾; *cf.* also **ዓም : እምዓም**; **ዕለት : እምዕለት**; **ሀገር : እምሀገር**. — A few others have a Suff. Pron. appended (like **ትካትየ** “formerly”), or other terminations originally pronominal. The most common among them is the Neuter *ū* (*hū*)⁽³⁾ “of it”, “thereof”: **ቀዲሙ** (“the first of it”) “in the first place”, “earlier”, “once”, “sooner” (very common); **ቀዳሚሁ** and **ቀዳሚየ**, v. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 463 *sq.*; **ላዕሉ** (“height of it”) “above”, Josh. 16, 5; **ባሕ ቲቱ** (“solitude of it” § 157, 2) “only”, “alone”, “merely”, Gen. 2, 6

2. Other forms of Adverbs, being originally Nouns with or without inflection or with Special terminations.

(1) Still used as a Predicate, Hen. 82, 7.

(2) On the other hand **ቅድ-ም** in Matt. 20, 8; 23, 26 is Imperative.

(3) According to BARTH ZDMG XLVI, p. 691, this *ū* is to be regarded as the Nominative of an original Diptote declension.

(generally placed after the qualified word); and still oftener the shorter form **ብሕቱ** “only”, “yet”, “however”, “but rather” (v. § 168); **ታሕቱ** “under”; **ዳእሙ** (“the firmness of it”, “the truth of it”; same root as in **ሥዕ**, **ሥዕ**, **ሥዕ**) “much more”, “however”, *e. g.* Ps. 1, 2, 5; Mark 4, 17; 5, 36; Philipp. 2, 12; **ከንቱ** (§ 157, 2) “in vain”, “for nothing” (also **በከንቱ** and **ከንቶ**); **በሕቱ** (properly ‘according to the measure of it’; **በ** is preposition here) “considerably”, “greatly”, Mark 7, 3; Deut. 9, 21; Josh. 8, 4 &c.; **ለዝሉፉ** and **ለዝላፉ** (‘for the duration of it’) “for ever”. In other instances it is *ā* on the contrary that makes its appearance, and not *ū*; but this *ā* is not to be regarded as the Suff. Pron. of the 3rd pers. Sing. fem., but as the *ā*, **ሃ**, which originally signifies “toward”, and which next is made use of in the formation of the Accusative (§ 143): **አፍኣ**⁽¹⁾ and **አፍኣ** (‘at the mouth’) “outside”, “without”, “beyond”, “outward” (and Suff. Prons. may here again be attached, as in **አፍኣሁ** “outside of it”, Matt. 23, 25 *sq.*, or even Prepositions prefixed, *e. g.* **በአፍኣ** Gen. 9, 22⁽²⁾) and **ግሙራ** (‘toward the complete’, ‘toward completion’) “wholly”, “ever”, “altogether”, “at all”, *omnino*, nearly always in clauses of negative import, *e. g.* **ግሙራ** : **ኢተናገረ** : **ሰብእ** “never has a man spoken” John 7, 46; **ኢትምሕሉ** : **ግሙራ** “ye shall not swear at all” Matt. 5, 34: also **ለግሙራ** “for ever and ever”. And in the same acceptation in which these words take an *ā*, **ከላ** takes **ሄ**, and **ከሐተ**, **ኔ** (§ 160). Of more obscure origin is **ትማልም**⁽³⁾ “yesterday”, “long ago” (**ትማል**). Of quite peculiar character is **ዓዲ** “yet”, “farther”, in form manifestly an Adjective, fashioned afresh out of an original **ዓድ** (**עוד**)⁽⁴⁾, and thus meaning properly “lasting”, and then farther stiffened into an Adverb, just like **ቀዳሚ**. But, from its original Adjective-signification, it has preserved the peculiarity of assuming personal Suffixes with great frequency, in the mode and the meaning which are explained in § 156, making its appearance in this

(¹) This way of writing the word is still pretty constant in the older manuscripts.

(²) The *ā* in **ከዋላ** and **ከወላ** “behind” is probably to be explained differently, as the word in this form appears also as a Subst.

(³) On this word v. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ p. 91; [and JENSEN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*’ XI, p. 352 *sq.*].

(⁴) [V. also BARTH, ‘*Etymol. Studien*’, p. 60 & ‘*Wurzeluntersuchungen*’ (Leipzig 1902), p. 34, where **ዓዲ** is said to have sprung from ‘*ād + ye.*’]

way in the sentence as an independent word in apposition to another: **ዓዲሁ ፡ ሕያው ፡ ውእቱ** “he is yet alive” Gen. 43, 28 (but **ከመ ፡ ዓዲ ፡ ሕያው** in V. 27); 45, 3 (but otherwise in V. 6); **እመ ፡ ዓዲሁ ፡ ሕያው ፡ ዮሴፍ** Gen. 45, 28; **እንዘ ፡ ዓዲሆሙ ፡ ሀለዉ** Judges 19, 11; 6, 24; farther Gen. 18, 12; 44, 14; Acts 9, 1; Hen. 89, 25. Lastly, **ዓዲሁ** (‘it continuing’) is once more used adverbially for “yet”, “still” Matt. 16, 9.

3. Many Adverbial notions may be expressed in Semitic, and accordingly in Ethiopic, by means of Verbs,—a subject which will be dealt with in § 180. Somewhat different is the case of a fully inflected Verb being brought,—parenthetically as it were,—into the current of the words which constitute the sentence, so that it presents the appearance of an additional qualification. Thus **አከለ** or **የአከለ** “it amounts to”, “it suffices for” is very often interpolated in a sentence, sometimes impersonally, sometimes as a personal Verb assuming the due changes of gender and number,—for the purpose of expressing the idea of “nearly”, “about”: **ወነበሩ ፡ ህየ ፡ የአከለ ፡ ዐሠርተ ፡ ዓመተ** “and they remained there about ten years” Ruth 1, 4; “there fell of Israel” **የአከለ ፡ ፬-በእሴ** “about thirty men” (Nominative) Judges 20, 31; in the same way **አሐዝዝ** “I imagine”, for “probably”, “likely” Gen. 37, 10; Ps. 123, 2, 3; and **ብቀ-ዐኒ** (“oblige me”, “do me the favour”) for “pray!” in requests; also **ኅድ-ጎሰ** “let it alone!” or **ኅድ-ጉሰ** “let (*pl.*) alone!” for “not to speak of”, “without mentioning”, *e. g.* 1 Cor. 6, 3. A Perfect, employed in an Optative clause, in the Arabic fashion (but *v.* § 199) is met with in **ሐሰ** or more commonly **ሐሰ⁽¹⁾** “far be it”, either set by itself Gen. 18, 25, or followed by **ለ**, *e. g.* **ሐሰ ፡ ሊተ** “be it far from me!” Acts 10, 14; Matt. 16, 22; Josh. 22, 29.—A very old word, which can only be explained now from the Hebrew, is found in **እንዳሂ** “perhaps” (followed by **ለእመ** “whether”) John 4, 29; Acts 11, 18; 23, 9; 2 Cor. 11, 3; Rom. 5, 7; compounded of **እን** = **יֵן** (§ 62, *c*) and **ዳሕ**, an old Infinitive from **ገን**, **የድዐ** “to know”, with the Suff. Pron. of the 1st pers. Sing. **ኔ**, which is obsolete in Ethiopic (§ 149), and thus meaning literally “not my knowing”, “I do not know”. In this sense it still occurs, 2 Cor. 12, 2, 3 (*cf.* Gal. 4, 11). We can also understand from this

3. Adverbial
Notions
expressed
by Verbs.

(¹) حَاشَ EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ I, p. 369.

account of the word, why it should be so often followed by **ለአመ** “whether”.

4. Adverbial
Indication
of the
Language
in which
anything is
spoken or
written.

4. Finally, in Foreign words from the Greek, a termination **ιστι** has been taken over, to form Adverbs,—from Adjectives derived from the names of Nations—, which indicate the *language*, in which anything is spoken or written: **ሮማይስጢ**, “Roman” *i. e.* “in Latin”, **ዕብራይስጢ**, “in Hebrew” &c. The later writers leave out the *ῑ*: **ሮማይስጥ** John 19, 20 (PLATT); **ዕብራይስጥ** Acts 26, 14; **ሶርስጥ** “in Syriac”. These forms may also have the prefix **በ**:—**በዕብራይስጥ** Luke 23, 38; John 19, 20; or they may be preceded by a Construct State: **ነገረ : ዕብራይስጢ**, “the Hebrew language”. Acts 21, 40; [**ልሳነ : ዕብራይስጥ** ‘*Chrest.*’, p. 17, line 10].

II. PREPOSITIONS.

General
Account of
Preposi-
tions.

§ 164. Except the two or three Prepositions which have to make up for the Cases wanting in Nouns (§ 142), and which are accordingly in very frequent use and are greatly abbreviated in form, the greater number of Prepositions are derived from Nouns, and are kept true to their original form. A few are words originally Conjunctions, or at least Adverbs derived from Pronominal roots. The number of simple Prepositions in Ethiopic is very large, and the body of Prepositions becomes all the larger that a host of simple Prepositions may be farther combined with others, in order to reach the finer distinctions of relation. Every one of these Prepositions has the power of subordinating to itself a Noun, many even an entire sentence. The nature of the subordination is the same as with every other Noun,—that is to say, it is effected by means of the Construct State relation (§ 144). Every word which is employed as a Preposition stands, to the word dependent upon it, in the relation mentioned, and all of them therefore end in *a* (or *ā*). At the same time it will be shown farther on, that several of them once had a fuller ending, in *ē* (§ 167). Many of them, particularly those which originally indicate relations of Space and Time, must be conceived as simultaneously standing in the Accusative (of Place or Time). As the Preposition is in the Constr. St., it must naturally precede the Noun. Still, Ethiopic has the power of placing a few Prepositions after their regimen, at least

when that is the Relative Pronoun (§ 202)⁽¹⁾. Besides, Prepositions may be combined together or be made dependent on one another in manifold ways: **በ**, **ለ**, **እም**, **እንተ** are those which combine most frequently with other Prepositions. The majority of those words which are in use as Prepositions, are no longer preserved in the language in any other signification; it is only a minority that appear in still other uses. Along with these decided Prepositions, there are words too which are just at a transitional stage, on the way to become decided Prepositions. Several Nouns, which indicate a place or a time, a measure, or other relation, may, on taking the Accusative or the Construct State, supply the place of a Preposition. They are but rarely used, however, in this way, and it is matter of doubt whether they should altogether be counted among the Prepositions.

(a) *The Prepositions most frequently employed, and most subjected to abbreviation*, and which at the same time are prefixed either invariably, or at least often, to the word depending on them, are the following:—

The
Prepositions
in most
frequent
use:—1. **በ**.

1. **በ**⁽²⁾ (always attached to the following word) “in”, but branching out from this original meaning into many other meanings. (a) It expresses, first of all, rest and continuance at a place, or in a time or an object: **በምድር** “in the land”; **በሳት : ሌሊት** “in this night”; **በሠራቆቶሙ** “in their rising” (“while or when they rise”); **በስሙ : አምላክ** “in the name of God”; **ኅልፉ : በፍርሃት : ወበፍሥሐ** “they departed, (being) in fear and joy” Matt. 28, 8. On rare occasions it is used with verbs of motion, in the sense of “toward”, “to”, though rather oftener in the hostile meaning of “against”. More frequently it may express mere neighbourhood or contiguity to anything, *e. g.* **ተዐቅረ : በእብን** “to stumble against (or at) a stone” Matt. 4, 6; 11, 6; or passing through anything, *e. g.* **ይገብእ : በጀኖኅት** “he returns (‘in the first’) through the first door” Hen. 72, 25. Still more frequently it is associated with certain verbs, which may thus be regarded as representing a figurative entering into, or abiding in, the object concerned, such as **ሠምረ : በ**

(1) Just as even **ኅበ**, **ሶበ**, **ዲበ** have themselves originated from the appending of **በ**.

(2) No doubt connected with **בְּ**, **בֵּל**;—in use, besides, in all the Semitic languages [except Assyrian].

“to take pleasure in”; **አምነ : በ** “to believe in”; **ተማኅፀነ : በ** “to entrust one’s self with”, “to open one’s heart to” &c.

(b) Inasmuch as a single individual, proceeding in the society of others or with a crowd, is, so to speak, *in* the same or *among* the same, **በ** takes also the signification “with”, *e. g.* Hen. 1, 4, 9, or “among” (*inter*);—and inasmuch as that which takes place through a certain means, or by the operation of a certain cause, is regarded as contained *in* the same, it may farther signify “with”, “by means of”, “by reason of”, “from” or “out of”, *e. g.* **አእመረ : በ** (= **ኃ**) 1 John 3, 16 &c.; **በክነፊክ : ክድነኒ** “cover me with (‘by means of’) thy wings” Ps. 16, 9; **በግዝፈተ : ልቡ** “from hardness of heart”; **በኩሉ : ዘአበሰት** “on account of every fault” Matt. 19, 3; **በእደ** “in or by the hand (of any one)”, *i. e.* “by means of him”; **ዘመወ : በ** “to commit fornication with any one” (as the means) Matt. 5, 28; **ሐይወ : በ** “to live by something” Deut. 8, 3; Gen. 27, 40; Matt. 4, 4; and accordingly it is used even of a personal agent (*per, a*) Matt. 18, 7; 14, 2 &c. In like manner one says in Ethiopic that something happens “in” this or that way, *e. g.* **በሐሰት** “in falsehood”, “falsely” (for other examples, v. § 163, 1), where it answers to our “after”, “according to”, “—ly”, “in”: **በሥምረትክ** “in thy good pleasure” Ps. 50, 19; **በአስራብ** “in streams”, “like a stream”; **በእግረ : ደቂቅ : ነሐውር** “according to the foot of the children (‘as the children are able to walk’) we proceed” Gen. 33, 14 &c.; or **በኵልቀ** “in number”, “by number” Hen. 89, 60; and then too it is used in reduplicated form with a distributive sense (§ 159, g): **በበ : ምድሮም** “according to their (several) countries” Gen. 10, 5; **በበዘመዶም** “after their several kinds” Gen. 7, 14. Hence it is also found with words conveying comparison, “with”, “to”, “by”, “after”, *e. g.* **ትትሜሰል : በድንግል** “thou art to be compared to a virgin”, and with words of naming “by” or “after” something, *e. g.* Hen. 72, 36; and particularly to indicate the price “at” or “for”, in conceptions of buying, giving, taking, *e. g.* Gen. 30, 16; Hen. 5, 6; or words of punishing “for”, *e. g.* **ተቀየመ : በ** “to avenge one’s self for (something)”. But manifold as are the meanings of this Preposition, they are yet far from being all in frequent use. On the contrary, for the most of these derived meanings the language possesses other words devoted exclusively thereto, which are much more frequently employed. The most usual significations of **በ** are “in”, “at”, “with” or “by means of” (Instrument),

“on” or “after” (Kind and Manner); “at” or “for” (Worth or Value).

2. **ለ**⁽¹⁾ (always attached to a following word) expresses 2. **ለ**.
 direction toward something: “to”, “toward”. (a) It may thus take an entirely Locative meaning: **ሐረ : ለ** “to go to” Hen. 56, 2; **ይገብክ : ፀሐይ : ለጽባሕ** “the sun returns to the east” Hen. 72, 13, 15; **አሐዱ : ለካልኡ : ይኔጽር** “one looks to the other” Hen. 41, 7; or in a Temporal sense: **በጽሐት : ለተፈጽሞ** “it has reached completion” Gen. 6, 16; **ለጸቢሐ : እሑድ** “toward the dawn of the first day (of the week)” Matt. 28, 1; **ለዓለም** “for ever”; **ለዝላፋ** “in perpetuum”. It farther introduces the object for which an action is set a-going, e. g. **ይጸምኡ : ለጽድቅ** “(and) thirst (3rd pl.) after righteousness” Matt. 5, 6; **ረስሐ : ለኩነኔ** “he is liable to doom” Matt. 5, 21; or with verbs of becoming it introduces that which anything comes “to”, e. g. **ወኮነ : ለመንፈስ : ሕይወት** “and he became a living soul (‘soul of life’)” Gen. 2, 7. It also points to the ‘purpose’, e. g. “the stars are **ለተኣምር** for signs” Gen. 1, 14, 15; **ሠናይ : ለበሊዕ** “good to eat” Gen. 2, 9; **ይበርቁ : ለበረከት** “they flash for a blessing” Hen. 59, 1; Matt. 23, 5; 26, 12. Whence it is farther employed to specify “for whom”, — “for whose advantage” anything happens (*Dativus commodi*): **ለክሙ** “for you” i. e. “for your benefit” Hen. 5, 1; “give him this **ሊተ : ወለከ** for me and thee” Matt. 17, 27; **ጸለዩ : ለ** “to pray for” any one; **ሐዘነ : ለ** “to mourn for” one; **ተባከሰ : ለ** “to fight for” one; and, generally, it is the word to express the *Dative*. (b) But it also expresses quite commonly “with regard to”, e. g. **ምንተ : እንከ : ትፈቅዱ : ሎቱ : ሰማዕተ** “what farther need have you of testimony with regard to him?” Matt. 26, 65. It may accordingly indicate any relation, and therefore the Genitive relation, e. g. **ካልክ : ትእዛዝ : ለብርሃን : ንኡስ** “a second (*acc.*) ordinance (namely) of the smaller light” Hen. 73, 1; **እግዚእ : ለሰንበት** “Lord of the Sabbath” Matt. 12, 8, as well as the Accusative relation, especially with those verbs which in other tongues also may be easily connected with the Dative: **ሰብሐ : ለ**; **ባረከ : ለ**; **ጸውዑ : ለ** &c. “to praise, bless, name (call for) any one”; **ፀረፈ : ለ** “to speak evil against (any one)” Matt. 12, 31.—*Cf.* also ‘*Chrest.*’, p. 42, line 26; p. 44, line 1. Still, this employment of **ለ**, to indicate the Genitive and Accusative, has

(1) Connected with **ከ**, **ከ**, as in the rest of the Semitic languages.

continued to be of rather infrequent occurrence in Ethiopic; but so much the oftener does it come about that, when a person or an object has been signified by a Suff. Pron., and this person or object is subsequently and specially mentioned, **ለ** is prefixed to it, in order to establish the reference of the Suffix to the Noun, *e. g.* **ጸውዖ : ለሕዝብ** “he called to it (referring to) the people” = “he called to the people”. **ለ** is employed in this way in almost every sentence, seeing that, on special grounds (to be afterwards discussed), this periphrasis of the direct Genitive-, Dative-, and Accusative-subordination, effected by means of a Suff. Pron. and **ለ**, has attained extraordinary predominance. As the most general Preposition **ለ** may take the place of other prepositions in the course of an extended series, *e. g.* **ምስሌክሙ : ወለዘርእክሙ** “with you and with your seed” Gen. 9, 9. Comparatively seldom does it express “conformity” or “suitability”, as for instance in **ለመፍቅድ : ዘኢሁ** “according to *his* good pleasure”, or **ለቅንኣቶሙ** “*δὲ* *φθόρον*” Matt. 27, 18. Like **በ**, **ለ** also may be reduplicated, with a distributive force (§ 159, *g*), *e. g.* **ሲሳይ : ዘለለ : ዕለት** “daily food” (‘which is for every day’) Matt. 6, 11; **ለለ : በዓል** “at every feast” Mark 15, 6; also with an adverbial accusative:—**ለለ : ነግሠ : ወሰርክ** *Enc. Syntax*.

3. **እምነ**.

3. The third most important preposition is **እምነ**⁽¹⁾, or in its prefixed form, **እም**, the former being the ground-form, which occurs more frequently than **እም**, particularly in the older manuscripts⁽²⁾, and which must always re-appear whenever Suffixes come to be attached. The latter is just an abbreviated form of the other,—as **ኒ**, coming after **ም**, readily disappeared. **እም** is invariably attached as a prefix to the word which follows it, losing even the **ም** in writing, if that word itself begins with *m* (§ 55): **እምታ** *emmetā*, **እመክን** *emmakān*, **እምቱ** *emmōtū*. **እምነ** or **እም** signifies “from”, “out of”, and is most variously applied. First it is used with reference to Place: **አፍኣ : እምሀገር** “away out of the city”; “they gather all the unbelievers **እመንግሥቱ** out of his kingdom” Matt. 13, 41; **እምልብ** “out of the heart” Matt. 12, 34; 18, 34: and also with reference to Time, “since”, “from—forward”:

(1) V. § 34. It is the Hebr. **מִן**, in the Constr. St. **מִן** and with **אֶל** prefixed; and in the last resort it is to be referred to a root **מנן** “to part”. Cf. KÖNIG, p. 144.

(2) [Cf. *e. g.* N. ROUPP, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ XVI, p. 306 sq.]

— **እምውእቱ : ሰዓት** “from that very hour” Matt. 9, 22 (*cf.* V. 20); **እምዝ** (‘from this time onward’, ‘henceforward’) “thereafter”; **እም ሰሚዐ : ቃሉ** “as soon as he heard the word”; **እምቅድመ : ዓለም** “from the beginning of the world onward” Matt. 24, 21; Hen. 41, 4. Deserving of notice are cases in which the preposition is associated with adverbial locutions, like **እምይእተ : ዕለተ** Dan. Ap. 1, 64 (in some manuscripts); **እምይእተ : አሚረ** 1 Kings 16, 13; 30, 25. Farther, **እምነ** is employed to introduce the person or thing, from whom or from which anything is sought, taken, or derived, *e. g.* **አስተብቀዐ : እም** “to crave (a thing) from (any one)” Hen. 63, 1; **ስእለ : እምነ** “to make enquiry of (any one)”, “to ask of” &c.; also to point to the material, of which a thing is made or from which it has originated, Hen. 26, 5; 28, 2; and hence it is found with verbs of fulness such as **መልአ, ጸግበ** and the like. It is used especially to indicate the author, *e. g.* **ፀንሰት : እምነ** “she conceived by (so-and-so)”, *cf.* Gen. 19, 36,—and the cause, **እምፍርሀቱ** “for fear of him” Matt. 28, 4; [*Kebra Nag.* 39 b 21]; **እምትዕቢት** “from pride”; **እምፍሥሐሁ** “for joy thereat” Matt. 13, 44; *cf.* Matt. 14, 26; Ps. 37, 8; **ኢይትኃለቁ : እምነ : ብዝኑ** “(which) cannot be numbered for multitude” Gen. 32, 13, *cf.* 48, 10; whence **እምነ** has the meaning “by reason of” in Gen. 27, 46. It not unfrequently occurs with a Passive, just like the Latin preposition *a*, Matt. 8, 24; 14, 24 &c. It is also used to indicate the grounds on which a recognition or judgment proceeds, *e. g.* **እምፍሬሆሙ : ታአምርዎሙ** “by their fruits ye shall know them” Matt. 7, 20; 12, 33 (but yet **በ** also appears in this sense, as in Gen. 15, 8); **ርእየ : እም** “to see *or* understand from *or* by (me)” Judges 7, 17; **እምቃላቲክ : ትጸድቅ** “by thy words thou shalt be justified” Matt. 12, 37. Its meaning has more of its original material reference, when a ‘withdrawal from’ something, a ‘separation, parting or sundering’ is given expression to, *e. g.* in Matt. 13, 49; 21, 43, or in **የዐርብ : ፀሐይ : እምሰማይ** “the sun sets from out the heavens” Hen. 72, 5; Gen. 8, 2; hence it is used with verbs of ‘withholding from’ **ከልአ : እምነ**, or **ኢምሀኮ : ለወልድክ : እምኔየ** “thou hast not kept back thine own son from me” Gen. 22, 12; with verbs of fearing, or ‘fleeing from anything’, or ‘guarding against’ anything, or of ‘concealing from’ (Matt. 11, 25; Gen. 18, 17); and with verbs of defectiveness and of emptiness (like **ዐርቀ**)⁽¹⁾. The

(1) In the Arabic text of *G. Ad.* عَنْ is often the corresponding Prep.

meaning of ‘choosing out of’ is associated with that of ‘separating from’, and so **እምነ** is also the word which indicates comparison between higher and lower, and which is used in the periphrasis for the Comparative and Superlative: **ቡርክት፡አንቲ፡እም አንስት** “blessed art thou among women” Luke 1, 28; **ዐቢይ፡እምነ፡ዚአሆሙ** “greater than theirs” Josh. 19, 9; “the serpent **ትጠብብ፡እምነሉ፡አርፄ** was more subtle than all the beasts” Gen. 3, 1; (“the ark was lifted up **እምነ፡ምድር** above the earth” Gen. 7, 17). So too it is invariably employed, when a part of the whole has to be expressed: **ክልሑቱ፡እምኔከሙ** “two of you” Matt. 18, 19; **መኑ፡እምክልሆሙ** “which of the two?” Matt. 21, 31; **ወቦ፡እም አርዳኢሁ** “and there was one of his disciples” Matt. 12, 47; **ይቤ፡ለእምጠቢባን** “*dixit uni e sapientibus*” *Fal.* ⁽¹⁾, f. 60; and thus it often serves to supply the place of the missing conceptional expression for “a few”, “one or two”, “several”: **ነሥኡ፡እምነ፡እንስሳ** “he took one or two beasts” Gen. 8, 20; 6, 2, 19; 27, 28; 45, 23 ⁽²⁾. —Lastly, in Ethiopic one may say “on the side of” (**በለፌ, በገቦ**), or “from the side of” **እምለፌ** John 19, 18; Rev. 22, 2; and so **እምነ** often stands as specifying the direction of anything in space:—**እምነ፡አፍኣ** “outside” Gen. 7, 16; **እምውሳጤሁ** “inside” Ex. 25, 11; **እምድኅር** “behind”, “from behind” Ex. 14, 27.—On **በእምነ** and **ለእምነ** cf. the ‘*Lexicon*’.

The other
more
frequently
used Pre-
positions
(4—10).

§ 165. (b) *The other more frequently used Prepositions* are:

4. **ኅቦ** “with” and “toward” ⁽³⁾, compounded of **ኅ** and **ቦ**, meaning literally “in—there”, and also in use relatively as “where” (§ 161, b). It is found both with verbs of ‘rest’ and of ‘motion’, and signifies “near to”, “with” or “to”: **ቃል፡ሀለው፡ኅቦ፡እግዚአብሔር** “the Word was with God” John 1, 1, 2; **ኅቦ፡ሙሐዘ፡ማይ** “by a stream of water” Ps. 1, 3; **ኅቦ፡መኑ፡ነሐውር** “to whom shall we go?” John 6, 68; **እንተ፡ኅቤዩ** “who (*f.*) is with me” Cant. 1, 9, 15; 2, 2. It is always employed with verbs of ‘going’, ‘coming’, ‘sending for or to’ any person or place, and

(1) [*i. e. Maṣḥafa Falasfā, ‘Book of the Philosophers’.* TR.]

(2) [*Cf. also Kebra Nag.* 121 b 16: **ከመ፡ኢትርክባሙ፡እምእንተ፡ትመጽእ፡መቅወፍት፡ለኃጥአን** “so that there may not befall them something of the punishment that overtakes sinners”; and *ibid.* p. 57 (Ethiop. text), *Ann.* 16, **እምሰብእ.**]

(3) It corresponds in meaning both to **إِلَى** and **عِنْدَ**. [On its etymology cf. also PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVII, p. 272.]

‘delivering up to’ any one, **አግብኦ ፡ ኀበ** Matt. 20, 18. It also expresses in a general way ‘direction toward’ anything, just like “toward”: **ነጸረ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ሰማይ** “to look toward heaven” Matt. 14, 19; and it is often used by way of an alternative for **ለ**, *e. g.* **ጸርኝ ፡ ጸለዩ ፡ ስእለ ፡ ተማኅፀን ፡ ኀበ** “to cry, pray, or address a request to” any one, “to trust in” any one; and **ከፈለ ፡ ኀበ** “to distribute to”.—It is frequently compounded with **ለ**, **በ**, **እም**; **ለኀበ** “away to” anything Hen. 56, 5, and in a peculiar use in Ex. 4, 16; **ቡኀበ** “with”, “among” (*inter*), *e. g.* “ye shall be hated **ቡኀበ ፡ ነሉ ፡ ሰብአ** among all men” Matt. 10, 22; **አእመረ ፡ ቡኀበ** “to seek instructions from *or* to be instructed by *or* of” Matt. 14, 8; used particularly to express buying ‘at’ any one’s (= ‘from’ any one) Gen. 23, 19; and, farther, having the meaning “with reference to”, “in comparison with”: **ቡኀበ ፡ መዋዕለ ፡ አበዊዩ** “in comparison with the days of my fathers” Gen. 47, 9. Lastly **እምኀበ** “from the side of any one”, “from” (**ፀጃጃ**, **ጥጃጃ**), is very common with verbs of ‘borrowing’, ‘demanding’, ‘taking’, ‘learning by enquiry’, and ‘being given’ John 6, 65; Matt. 2, 9, 16; 5, 42; 11, 27; and of frequent occurrence with the Passive, to introduce the author or agent, *e. g.* Matt. 1, 22; 2, 15; 3, 6; 4, 1; 6, 2, being more usually employed in this signification than **እም** or **በ**.

5. **እስከ** “till”, “as far as”, “up to”, from **ጉ** and **ከ**, properly “till that” (§ 64, *b*), was originally a Conjunction, and then came into use in a more extended form as a Preposition, dislodging the old **ጉ**;—it is still occasionally lengthened by means of **ኀ** (§ 160, *a*) ⁽¹⁾. It is used for Space and Time, and is the only word to express this relation, as **ለ** rather means “toward”: **እስከ ፡ አጽናፈ ፡ ምድር** “as far as the ends of the earth” Ps. 2, 8; **እስከ ፡ ይአዚ** “till now” Ps. 70, 18; also **እስከ ፡ ፴ጽባሕ** “for 30 mornings” Hen. 72, 9; or **እስከ ፡ ክልኤ ፡ መዋዕል** “within two days” Matt. 26, 2; Gen. 40, 13; and **እምተባዕቱ ፡ እስከ ፡ አንስቱ** “men and women” Josh. 6, 21; **እስከ ፡ ውኃተ ፡ አሚረ** Dan. 12, 1 (*cf. supra* p. 393, l. 5 *sqq.*). It is often followed by additional Prepositions of Time and Direction: **እስከ ፡ ለሞት** “until death”; **እስከ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ሚካ** “up to the house of Micah” Judges 18, 13; **እስከ ፡ ቅድመ** “as far as in front of”, (“up to the front of”) Judges 19, 10; **እስከ ፡ ለዓለም** “to eternity” Hen. 72, 1.—Frequently it passes into the idea of “even”, in which

(1) [On the old form **እስኪ**, v. HACKSPILL, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ XI, p. 128.]

case it is remarkable, that now and then the word which follows it stands in the Accusative, depending on a Verb: **እስከ : በግዑ** (Accusative) “up to the sheep” Josh. 6, 21, as if it only meant “even”.

6. **ከመ** “as”, “like”, is similarly a Conjunction of comparison originally (§ 169, **ከ** and **ከከ** § 64, *b*), but it is very frequently employed in the Construct St. as a Preposition. It is the same with the compound **በከመ** (‘in which manner, or sort’) “as”, “like”; when used with numerals it also means “nearly” or “about” Matt. 14, 21.

7. **ውስተ** “in”, “into” (*ἐν* and *εἰς*), is an Accusative, being at the same time in the Constr. St.,—probably from **ውስጥ** “interior” (§ 57) ⁽¹⁾. It is a Preposition in very common use, and in meaning corresponds for the most part to the Hebr. **לְ** and **בְ**. Its meaning is “into”, *e. g.* **ወድቀ : ውስተ : ግብ** “he falls into the ditch” Matt. 15, 14; **ቦአ : ውስተ : አፍ** “enters into the mouth” Matt. 15, 11; or “upon”, “on the surface of (anything)”, “on”, “to” or “at”, “with”, with verbs of motion and of abiding, like **ነበረ : ውስተ : መንበር** “to sit upon the chair” (properly: ‘to seat one’s self upon’); and it is of more common occurrence with verbs of motion than **በ**. “To ascend to” is **ዐርገ : ውስተ** Mark 16, 19; Matt. 15, 39; “to bring sacrifices ‘to the altar’” **ውስተ : ምሥዋዕ**; “to wander ‘on the earth’” **ውስተ : ምድር**; “to write ‘in a book’” **ውስተ : መጽሐፍ**; “dampness on the grass” **ጊሜ : ውስተ : ሣዕር** Deut. 32, 2; “to withdraw to” **ተግሕሠ : ውስተ** Matt. 15, 21; “to invite to (a feast)” **ጸውዐ : ውስተ** Matt. 22, 9; “to cast into (anything)” **ወደየ : ውስተ** Matt. 13, 47 &c. Specially to be noticed are the expressions: “to attach to (anything)” **ወሰከ : ውስተ**; **ደመረ : ውስተ** “to join to” Gen. 30, 40; and “to set one over (anything as overseer)” **ሠይመ : ውስተ** Matt. 25, 21; Gen. 41, 41 (**ላዕለ** V. 43); also with verbs of making, **ረሰየ : ውስተ** “to make into (anything)” Ex. 32, 10; Deut. 9, 14. It forms compounds with **በ** and **እም**; **በውስተ** is “within”, “in”, “with”, “among” (*inter*): **በውስተ : አህጉር** “in the cities” Matt. 11, 20; **በውስተ : ሞት** “in death” Ps. 6, 5; **በውስተ : ምሳላት** “at feasts” Matt. 23, 6; **በውስተ : ቶሎ** “among them” Matt. 23, 34; the use is peculiar in **ንስማዕ : በውስተ : አፋሃ** “we will learn it (‘in’) out of her mouth” Gen. 24, 57;—**እም ውስተ** is “out of anything” or “down from anything”, always with the implied idea that previously the subject was *in* that thing or

(1) But *cf.* Assyrian *ištu*.

up in that position: **ዘይወዕኔ : እምወስተ : አፍ** “that which proceeds out of the mouth” Matt. 15, 11, 19; **ወረደት : እምወስተ : ገመላ** “she alighted from her camel” Gen. 24, 64; or **ይመትሩ : አዕ ደቀ : እምወስተ : ዕፀው** Matt. 21, 8; **መኑ : እምወስተትከሙ** “what man is there (‘from the midst of’) among you?” Matt. 12, 11. Notice also the Adverbial combination **ውስተ : አሐተኔ** (as well as **በአሐተኔ**) *Sx. Genb.* 18.

8. **ላዕለ** “upon”, “over”, “above”, Acc. and Constr. St. of **ላዕል**⁽¹⁾ “height”, is equivalent generally to ከሂ, and signifies first, “on” an object and “upon” an object, being often exchangeable in this meaning with **ውስተ**, *e. g.* **ላዕለ : ደብር** “on the mountain”; **ረሐነ : ላዕለ** “to spread upon or over anything” Matt. 21, 7; **አን በረ : ላዕለ** “to place or lay upon anything” Matt. 12, 18; 19, 15; **ተጽዕነ : ላዕለ** “to ride upon” (also with **በ** and **ዲበ**): farther, **ዘርአ : ላዕለ : በእሲት** “to impregnate a woman” Gen. 15, 5; **ይምጸእ : ሰላ ምክሙ : ላዕሌሃ** “let your peace come upon it (*i. e.* ‘upon the house’, —*fem.*)” Matt. 10, 13. Next, it comes to mean “at”, “in” or “on”, *e. g.* **ላዕለ : በሕር** “by the sea” Josh. 16, 3; **አልቦ : ሥርወ : ላዕሌሁ** “there is no root in him” Matt. 13, 21; or “in addition to”, “besides”, **ኢትንሣእ : በእሲተ : ላዕሌሆን** “thou shalt take no wife besides them” Gen. 31, 50. More figuratively it is used to express ‘the duty which is laid upon any one’: **ትፈዲ : ዘላዕሌከ** “pay what thou owest” (‘that which is laid upon thee’); **ሚላዕሌነ** “what is that to us?” Matt. 27, 4; [or ‘duty toward any one’: **ምንተ : በቲ : ላዕለ : ወ ልድ : ለበእሲት : ዘእንበለ : ዘ** “what other duty has a woman toward a son but to—?” *Kebra Nag.* 34 a 20 sq.] and “to rule over”, *e. g.* Matt. 20, 25. Then too it means “to set above any one”, to the extent of meaning “to have superior force against him”, or again “for him”, and thus it occurs very often in the hostile sense “against” with verbs of mocking, fighting against, or doing harm to any one, *e. g.* **ተሳ ለቀ : ላዕለ** Matt. 2, 16; 20, 19; **አሕሠመ : ላዕለ** Gen. 19, 7; **አበሰ : ላዕለ** Matt. 18, 21; Ps. 3, 1; 12, 3; Matt. 10, 21; **ስምዕ : ላዕለ** “testimony against any one” Matt. 24, 14; **ይቤ : ቃለ : ላዕለ** “(whosoever) speaketh a word against” Matt. 12, 32; **ኢይኩን : ላዕሌከ : ዝንቱ** “this shall not be unto thee” Matt. 16, 22; or in a friendly sense “for”, “for the advantage of” **አሠነየ : ላዕለ** “to do good to any

(1) [But v., on the other hand, BARTH, in ‘*Orientalische Studien*’ (1906), p. 790.]

one"; **ይጼሊ : ላዕሌከ** "he will pray for thee" Gen. 20, 7; **ዘንተ : ጽድቅ : ግበሪ : ላዕሌየ** "do me this right" Gen. 20, 13; **በእንተ : ፈሪ ሆትየ : ላዕሌከሙ** "by reason of my fear for you" G. Ad. 109, 23. **ላዕለ** also forms compounds with **በ** and **እም**. **በላዕለ** is still more precise than **ላዕለ** "upon", "over", *e. g.* Ps. 4, 7; "judgment upon any one" **በላዕለ** Hen. 22, 4; **በላዕለ** "over it" Hen. 28, 2; "there was found no unrighteousness **በላዕሌየ** in me" Ps. 16, 4; Gen. 44, 17; and in particular it is employed for "through", when any one is represented as the instrument, passive or active, of the completion of a transaction:—**መንፈስ : ይትናገር : በላዕሌከሙ** "the Spirit speaks through you" Matt. 10, 20; **ይትወለዱ : ውሉድ⁽¹⁾ : በላዕሌሆን** "(that) children be begotten of them" Hen. 15, 5; **ዘበላዕሌሁ : ይትሜ ጠውዎ** "through whom they get him" Matt. 26, 24; **በላዕለ : ሙሴ** "under Moses" ('under his rule') Josh. 20, 2. **እምላዕለ** is "down from", "away from" (**ነሄኳ**) Hen. 28, 2; Matt. 17, 18; 18, 9; or even much the same as **እምኅበ**, *e. g.* **ንሣእ : እምላዕሌየ** "accept from me" Gen. 21, 30.

9. **መልዕልተ**, the Accusative and Constr. St. of **መልዕልት** "height", is always found referring to Place—"above", "over", "upon": **መልዕልተ : ምድር** ('above') "upon the earth" Luke 6, 49; Gen. 7, 24; **መልዕልተ : ርእሱ** "over his head" Matt. 27, 37; Hen. 32, 2; **መልዕልተ : ነፋሳት** "above the winds" *Gadla 'Arag*. (GUIDI, 1905), p. 5. And,—just as in Hebrew,—"over a thing" has also the meaning "before it", especially in the phrase **ቆመ : መልዕል ቲሁ** "he stood before him" Gen. 18, 2; 22, 9; 24, 43; 41, 1. **በመልዕልተ** has the same meaning as **መልዕልተ**.

10. **ዲበ** "upon", "above", "over", to some extent synonymous with **ላዕለ**, seems to be compounded of **ዲ** (§ 62, *a*) and **በ**⁽²⁾, and thus would properly mean "at—the". First of all it is found with the same force as **ላዕለ**; we say "to build upon a rock" **ዲበ** Matt. 7, 25, 26; **ተጽዕነ : ዲበ** "to ride upon"; **ወድቀ : ዲበ : ከቡኩ** "it fell upon stony ground" Matt. 13, 5; "to settle upon", "to set upon" Matt. 14, 19; 23, 2; "to lay upon" Matt. 23, 4; "power over" Matt. 10, 1; "to place (as lord) over" Hen. 24, 6; **ነፍሱ : ዲበ : ገጹ : መንፈስ : ሕይወት** "breathed upon him ('his face') the breath of life" Gen. 2, 7. Next, it is often used in a hostile sense, "against", "in opposition to" Hen. 10, 9; 56, 7; Matt. 24, 7; Acts 23, 5;

(1) [FLEMMING's reading is **ውሉድ**, TR.]—

(2) Like **ኅበ**, **ሶበ**.

ፀረረ : **ዲበ** “to blaspheme against” Mark 3, 29. Farther, it is employed to introduce the object of an action, particularly with verbs which mean “to rejoice (over)” **ተፈሥሐ** : **ዲበ** Hen. 97, 2; “to weep (over)” Hen. 95, 1; “to mourn over” Hen. 12, 6; “to rely upon” Hen. 94, 8; and with verbs of ‘adding to’ “thereto”, “in addition to” **ተወሰከ** : **ዲበ** Hen. 82, 11⁽¹⁾; Numb. 32, 14; **ዲበ** : **ዝኒ** “and besides”.—**በዲበ** is interchangeable with **ዲበ** and is almost as common, *e. g.* Ps. 9, 42; Gen. 6, 12; 24, 18; Job. 16, 14; Hen. 20, 5⁽¹⁾. **እምዲበ** is “down from” Matt. 14, 29. — A peculiar use is met with in **ወስኮ** : **እምዲበ** : **ቆሙ** : **አሐተ** : **እመተ** “to add to his stature one cubit” Matt. 6, 27.

§ 166. 11. **መንገል** “towards”, “to” (*versus, juxta, erga*) expresses in the most forcible manner ‘direction towards anything’, and is chiefly used with reference to Space in the sense of “away to”, “opposite to”, “along”: **መንገል** : **እስጳንያ** “towards Spain”, “to Spain” Rom. 15, 24; **መንገል** : **የማን** “to or on the right hand” Luke 1, 11; **መንገል** : **ባሕር** to the sea”, and “by the sea” Matt. 4, 13; 13, 1; Mark 1, 16, and thus always in notices of the direction of a place, and of the cardinal points &c. More rarely it stands, with verbs of ‘inclination’ and the like, for “towards”, in the sense of the Latin *erga*. The word itself is the Accusative and Constr. St. of **መንገል** “the visible side of anything” (*√* **نَجَلَ**, *cf.* **نَجَدَ**, **نَجَّ**)⁽²⁾. It is also compounded with other prepositions, as in **ለመንገል** “towards”, in the sense of direction in space, Gen. 13, 14; and in a metaphorical sense ‘*erga*’ Hebr. 2, 17: or **እመንገል** either “in the direction of” (*v.* on **እም**, § 164, 3) Gen. 13, 11; or “on the side of”, *e. g.* “she is my sister **እመንገል** : **አቡየ** on my father’s side” Gen. 20, 12; **እመንገል** : **ወንጌል** “considered from the side of the Gospel”, “having regard to the Gospel” Rom. 11, 28;—or it is placed before other Prepositions of Place, as in **መንገል** : **ድኅረ** “to the rear (*or* back) of”; **መንገል** : **ቅድመ** “to the front of” &c. **እንተ** : **መንገል** is very common, *v. infra* No. 19.

12. **ምስል** “with” (*cum*), the Accusative and Constr. St. of **ምስል** “likeness”, properly signifies “in the likeness of”, *i. e.* “like”,

Prepositions
(Class b)
continued
(11—23).

⁽¹⁾ [In Hen. 82, 11 FLEMMING reads **ምስሌሆሙ** instead of DILLMANN’S **ዲበ**“; and in 20, 5 the former has **ዲበ** for the latter’s **በዲበ**. TR.]

⁽²⁾ [V., however, PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVII, p. 273, who compares the Southern Arabic **كُنْجَل** “way”.]

and is always used for “with”, in order to express ‘accompanying’ and ‘companionship’. It is the ordinary word for this relation (‘he [it] *as* he [it], or he *like* him’ = ‘he *with* him’), *e. g.* ሐረ : ኢየሱስ : ምስለ : አርዳኢሁ “Jesus went with his disciples”. It finds frequent employment with words which express reciprocal action: ‘to be at peace with’, ‘to fight with’, ‘to confer with’, *e. g.* ተናገረ : ምስለ Matt. 17, 3; next it expresses ‘in relation one to another’, *e. g.* ኢጊደገ : ምስረቶ : ምስለ : ሕያዋን “he has not left off his mercy to the living” Ruth 2, 20; ወሃይማኖቶሙ : የዐቅቡ : ጀ ምስለ : ካልኡ “and they keep faith one with another” Hen. 41, 5; even with verbs of ‘separation’, ንትራሐቅ : ጀ ምስለ : ካልኡ “we are to be separate the one from the other” Gen. 31, 49 (for which እምነ (እም) appears in Gen. 32, 17). In conformity with its fundamental meaning it is specially in place with verbs of ‘assimilating and equalising’, *e. g.* ተመሰልኩ : ምስሌከ “I may be compared with thee”; ይትዔረይ : መዓልት : ምስለ : ሌሊት “the day is the same as the night” Hen. 72, 20; and farther with verbs which indicate ‘being numbered among or regarded as’, *e. g.* ተኑለቄ : ምስለ : ኃዋኣን Is. 53, 12 and Luke 22, 37; *cf.* Ps. 87, 4; as well as with verbs of ‘joining’, *e. g.* ዘይትዌሰክ : ምስሌሆሙ “who is joined to them” Hen. 82, 20. On rare occasions the preposition is used to indicate that which one has upon him, or carries with him, *e. g.* “they came ምስለ : መጣብሕ : ወዕፀው with swords and staves” Matt. 26, 47 (for which in Verse 55 በ appears); or, again, in the sense of the Latin ‘*penes*’ Hen. 9, 5.

13. ቅድመ “before” (*ante* and *coram* ጎጃኝ), the Acc. and Constr. St. of ቅድም “front”, is used both of Space and Time: ቅድመ : ምሥዋዕ “before the altar” Matt. 5, 24; ቅድመ : የም “before the present time”; ቅድመ ‘*coram*’ Matt. 25, 32; 27, 11. በቅድመ “before”, is very common in the sense of *ante* and *coram*, Matt. 10, 32; 11, 10, 26; Ps. 9, 26, and “overagainst” Hen. 4⁽¹⁾: also እምቅድመ (ጎጃኝ) “from before”, “before”, *e. g.* እምቅድመ : አይኅ “before the flood” Matt. 24, 38; እምቅድመ : ገጽክ : ይወዕክ : ፍትሕየ “from before thy face shall come forth my sentence” Ps. 16, 3; and “by reason of” Hen. 9, 10; as well as ‘*contra*’: ዘእ ምቅድሜሆሙ : ነፋስ ‘*ventus contrarius*’ Matt. 14, 24.

(1) [Here the reading adopted by FLEMMING is በቀዳሚ for DILLMANN's በቅድሜ. TR.]

14. **ድጎረ** “after”, “behind”,—the opposite of **ቅድመ**—, the Acc. and Constr. St. of **ድጎር** “rear”, is also used both of Space and Time: **ድጎሬሆሙ** “back” Ps. 6, 10; **ድጎረ : ከሉ** “last of all” Mark 12, 6; **ተለወ : ድጎረ** “to follow after” Matt. 10, 38. Still more common is **እምድጎረ** in both meanings, of Time and Space: **ሐረ : እምድጎሬሆሙ** “he came behind them”; **እምድጎረዝ** “after this”; **እምድጎረ : አይጎ** “after the flood” Gen. 9, 20; **እምድጎረ : ሕቀ** Herm. p. 80; Matt. 21, 32. Still, in these cases **እም** is pretty often to be understood in its fundamental meaning: **ሐር : እምድጎሬየ** “get from behind me” Matt. 16, 23. We meet also with **በድጎረ** Hen. 65, 4; Matt. 15, 23.

15. **ማእከለ** “in the midst of”, “between”, “among” (*inter*), the Acc. and Constr. St. of **ማእከል** “the middle” (properly, ‘that which is comprised in something else, or contained in it’,—from **አከለ**, Causative of ነጋጋ); e. g. **ማእከሌየ : ወማእከሌከ** “between me and thee”; **ፈነዎሙ : ማእከለ : ተከላት** “he sent them among wolves” Matt. 10, 16; **ማእከለ : ባሕር** “in the midst of the sea” Matt. 14, 24. We have also **በማእከለ** “in the midst of” Matt. 14, 6; and **እማእከለ**, ገጃጃ Gen. 48, 12.

16. **ታሕተ** “below”, “under” (*sub*), the Acc. and Constr. St. of **ታሕት** “the ground or bottom”, e. g. **ታሕት : እገሬሁ** “under his feet” Ps. 8, 7; Matt. 22, 44; also found compounded with **በ** and **እም**.

17. Of the same meaning as the preposition last-mentioned appears **መትሕተ** “underneath”, the Acc. and Constr. St. of **መትሕት** “the underside”, Gen 1, 9; 6, 17; Ps. 17, 40; Hen. 26, 2. Also **እመትሕተ**, ጠጥጥ Hen. 14, 19⁽¹⁾.

18. **ዐውደ** “about”, “around” (*circa*), the Acc. and Constr. St. of **ዐውድ** “circuit”, is of common occurrence, e. g. Mark 3, 34; Ps. 30, 16.

19. **እንተ**⁽²⁾ “—wards”, “in the direction of”, or “to” &c., is manifestly taken from the Dem. Pron. **እንት** (§ 146, *fem.* of **ዝ**). It is quite as manifold in its references as the Accusative is, and it is withal one of the most subtle prepositions in meaning, to be found in Ethiopic. It often serves as a mere periphrasis for the

(¹) [Given as **እምታሕተ** in FLEMMING’s ‘*Enoch*’. TR.]

(²) Corresponding in origin,—not in meaning—, to **ጠጽ** and **ፈጽ**.

Accusative, particularly with verbs of motion: **ኅለፈ : እንተ :** **ይእቲ : ፍኖት** “went past that way” Matt. 8, 28; **ተግሕሠ : እም ህየ : እንተ : በሕቲቱ** “he withdrew from that place into retirement” Matt. 14, 13, 23; **ገብኡ : እንተ : ካልእ : ፍኖት** “they returned by another way” Matt. 2, 12; **ቦክ : እንተ : አንቀጽ** “he entered (‘the door’, *i. e.*) through or by the door” John 10, 1, 2; **የዐውድ : እንተ : በድው** “he wandereth through the waste” Matt. 12, 43; thus always **ኅለፈ : እንተ** “to pass through” Judges 11, 17 *sqq.*; **ሐወጸ : እንተ : መስኮት** “he looked out at the window” (‘through the window’) Gen. 26, 8; [*Kebra Nag.* 54 b 3 *sq.*]; **እንተ : ኖሳት** “through the gate” (interchangeable with **በ**) Hen. 72, 6 *sqq.*; **እንተ : የማንየ** “at my right hand”; **እንተ : ውስጣ : ወእንተ : አፍአሃ** “inwardly and outwardly” Gen. 6, 14; **እንተ : መንጸር** ‘in the direction of that which one is looking at’, *i. e.* “forward” Gen. 33, 12; **እንተ : ኅበ** “on what side” Judges 1, 25. Being a preposition of such general meaning, it is often placed before other prepositions, to determine their signification more exactly by the subordinate idea ‘in the direction of’: **እንተ : ዲበ : ማይ** “on the water (motion)” Matt. 14, 28; **እንተ : መንገለ : ገራውህ** “through the fields” Matt. 12, 1; **ኅለፍኩ : እንተ : ዲበ : በሕር** “I crossed over the sea” Hen. 32, 2; **እንተ : ድኅሬሁ** “(came) behind him” Matt. 9, 20; Cant. 2, 9; **እንተ : ቅድመ** Ex. 34, 6; Josh. 8, 14 &c.

20. **በእንተ**, a compound of **በ** and **እንተ** No. 19, is properly “in the direction of” or “in regard to”. Accordingly it signifies very frequently:—1. “by reason of” (more vigorously and clearly than **በ**), and then, “in payment of” and “for”, of price and wages, *e. g.* “I will serve thee seven years **በእንተ : ራሔል** for Rachel” Gen. 29, 18; 30, 15; and “for”, *e. g.* “to beg for any one”, “to intercede for”:—2. “with regard to”, “about”, to introduce the subject spoken, thought, or written &c. ‘about’, *e. g.* “what are we to do with the rest **በእንተ : አንስት** with regard to wives?” Judges 21, 7; **ይሌሎሙ : በእንተ : ዮሐንስ** “he spake to them of John” Matt. 17, 13; 11, 7, 10; 13, 10 &c.,—very often occurring in this sense; and thus it is the usual word to indicate the contents, in the headings of books and sections of books.—On **ከመ : እንተ** cf. DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’, col. 827.

21. **ህየንተ** “instead of”, originally **ህየተ** ⁽¹⁾,—formed from

(¹) V. DILLMANN’S ‘*Octat. Aethiop.*’, *Comm.* p. 5. The Nasal is interpolated in accordance with § 58.

ሆኖ “there” (‘in the place’) and an ending **ት**, which supports the sign of the Constr. St.,—is used in the case of ‘barter’ and ‘substitution’ (being interchangeable with **በእንተ** in the former meaning): “they requited me evil **ሆኖንተ : ሠናይት** for good” Ps. 37, 21; Gen. 44, 4; “he dies **ሆኖንተ : ሕዝብ** for the people” John 11, 50; and in the case of succeeding to a kingdom ‘in place of’ Gen. 36, 33 *sqq.*

22. **በበይነ** and **በበይናት**, from **በይን** (𐩦𐩣) “interval” (‘separation’) and **በ**. The Singular-form stands:—1. in a few instances, in the sense of “between” (*inter*), referring to space: **እለ : ይትላ ጸቃ : በበይኖን** “which are joined together” Ex. 28, 7; **ገጸን : ይት ናጸፋ : በበይኖን** “their faces must look to one another” Ex. 25, 20.—2. Inasmuch as that which is between two objects is withal the binding element between them, **በበይነ** signifies farther “occasioned by”, “caused by”⁽¹⁾, “through the influence of”, or “by reason of”, and it is frequently used with this meaning: Judges 20, 10; Mal. 1, 2; **በበይነዝ** “therefore” Ex. 20, 11; or “with regard to” (like **በእንተ**) Judges 21, 16.—The Plural-form, which is also written **በበናት**, appears only associated with Suffixes, and has always the meaning of “between”, “among”, with a spatial reference, *e. g.* Ex. 26, 3. It is greatly used in regard to anything which a number of persons do or cause “between *or* among themselves”, and thus it is specially found with verbs of St. III, 3, *e. g.* Matt. 9, 3; 16, 7, 8; 12, 26. We have even **መንግሥት : እንተ : ትትናፈቅ : በበይናቲሃ** “a kingdom which is divided against itself” Matt. 12, 25; and, with a reduplicated **በ**:—**በበ : በይናቲሆሙ** Gen. 42, 21, 28.

Along with **በበይነ**, appears **እንበይነ** (for **እምበይነ** § 57)⁽²⁾ frequently, in the sense of “for the sake of” and “about” (*de*): **እንበይነ : ዝንቱ** “for this cause” Mark 1, 38; **እንበይነ : ሙኑ : ይብል** “of whom he is speaking” John 13, 22; (and with the meaning “on account of”) Ex. 29, 36.—But the use of **በበይነ** and **እንበይነ** began generally to decline, and **በእንተ** came into more frequent use in their stead.

23. **እንበለ**, and still oftener **ዘእንበለ** “without”, “except”, is originally a Conjunction, and is still employed greatly as a Con-

(1) Cf. **بَيْنَ** *intervallum* and *nexus*; **अन्तर** “interval”, “cause”, “occasion”.

(2) [According to JENSEN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.*’ XI, p. 352, **እን** here is = Assyrian *in(a)*.]

junction. It stands for **አምበለ** (§ 57) ⁽¹⁾, and is a compound of **አም** “if” (§ 64, b) and **ከ** “not”, answering to **ከገረዳ**; **ዘአንበለ** is literally “which-if-not”, “if-it-not”. It means “without”: **አንበለ** : **ዘክነ** “without judgment” (*Lit.*); **አርብዓ** : **አንበለ** : **አሐዲ** “forty, save one” 2 Cor. 11, 24; Judges 20, 15, 17; **ዘአንበለ** : **ምሳሌ** “without a parable” Matt. 13, 34; **ዘአንበለ** : **ፍሬ** “without fruit” Matt. 13, 22; 15, 38; Hen. 89, 44; “except” Matt. 11, 27; 14, 17, 21; 21, 19.

(c) *Words occurring as Prepositions, but less frequently, or those which are just beginning to be used as Prepositions.*

24. **መቅድመ** “before”, “in preference to” Hen. 48, 2, the Acc. and Constr. St. of **መቅድም** “that which is in front”.

25. **ማዕድተ** “beyond”, “along” (from **ማዕድት** “a crossing”, “a ford” ⁽²⁾): Hen. 18, 10; Matt. 19, 1; Gen. 41, 3.

26. **ፍፍ** “towards” (properly, “way”, “direction”),—used both of Time and Place, *e. g.* **ፍፍ** : **ሰርክ** “towards evening” Gen. 3, 8; 8, 11; 19, 1.

27. **ጠቃ** and **ጥቃ** “hard by”, “close to” (properly, “exactness”) Matt. 20, 30; Ex. 24, 4; 29, 12; 15, 27; Josh. 8, 35; also, **በጥቃ** Ps. 140, 7.

28. **በጸ** “beside” Gen. 30, 40 (from **በጽ** “fellowship”).

29. **ምእኃዝ** “beside”, “close to” (from **ምእኃዝ** “boundary”); also **ማእኃዝ** Numb. 34, 3; Deut. 11, 30; Josh. 12, 9.

30. **ውእደ** “along” (connected with **ኀ**, Amhar. **ወደ**) in the Book of Jubilees; and **በውእደ** Deut. 32, 51.

31. **ተክለ** “in place of” (**ተክል** “place”) Ex. 21, 36; Hen. 89, 39; 103, 3.

32. **ተውላጦ** “for”, “in exchange for” (**ተውላጥ** “exchange”), v. LUDOLF, *‘Lex.’*.

33. **መንጸረ** and **አንጸረ** “over-against” (properly:—“that which one sees before him”, “the quarter one is looking to”) Josh. 8, 14; Mark 12, 41; 13, 3; Gen. 12, 8.

34. **አምሳለ** and **አርአያ** “like”, in poetic diction, (properly:—“after the image of”).

35. **መጠነ**, oftener **አምጣነ** “of the size of”, “as large as” (v. § 157, 1).

⁽¹⁾ [V. Note ⁽²⁾ on preceding page.]

⁽²⁾ [Also “the region beyond”, *regio opposita, ripa ulterior* (v. *‘Lex.’* & *‘Gloss.’*), which seems to come nearer the meaning of the Prep. **ጉዳ**.]

36. **ከወላ** and **ከዋላ** “behind”, and **አፍኦ** (**አፍኦ**) “outside of”.

Finally, we have farther the following remarkable words:

37. **በዕብሬት**, only used with suffixes, “for the sake of—” (**በኃይረ**, “because of”): **በዕብሬትከ**. Gen. 12, 13⁽¹⁾.

38. **አመ**, of Pronominal origin (§ 64, *b*), and properly a Conjunction, and Relative Adverb of Time (§ 161, *b*) “when”, but also used as a Preposition “at the time of”, *e. g.* Judges 14, 15, 17; Ps. 77, 12; Matt. 11, 22; 17, 23; Hen. 22, 4. In old printed books and manuscripts it still occurs often in the form **አሚ** (*cf.* § 167), which it must always take before Suffixes. It is very frequently found with the Suffix of the 3rd pers. Sing. Fem. **ሃ**, thus **አሚሃ** for “at that time” Matt. 2, 17; 13, 43; Luke 13, 1 (§ 160, *b*). Of quite similar origin and meaning is **ሶበ** (§ 62, 1, *a*), from **ሶ** (**ሰ**) “there” and **በ** “in”. It is regarded as a Relative at times,—and in those cases it means “when”,—but also as a Demonstrative, and then it signifies “at that time”. The latter is the fundamental meaning, of which the relative signification is only a development. In olden time it had the termination **፣ሶበ** (²),—sometimes used absolutely, as in **ይእተ ፣ሶበ** “in that ‘then’”, *i. e.* “at that very time” Matt. 7, 23, sometimes governing a Genitive; but in later Ethiopic this form is retained only with the Suffix **ሃ**, **ሶበሃ** “at that time”, “forthwith”, “then”, *e. g.* Matt. 12, 13 &c. Both **አሚሃ** and **ሶበሃ** are farther compounded with other prepositions: **ለሶበሃ** “for the moment” Luke 8, 13; **አምሶበሃ** “from that time forward”, “forthwith” Hen. 85, 4; 89, 20; **አምአሚሃ** “thereafter” Matt. 26, 16. Probably **ጊዜ** (³) is also of the same order with these,—according to the conjecture which has been already ventured (§ 64, *b*),—being of like origin, although it has usually the meaning “point of time”, “hour”, “moment” (*cf.* **ይእተ ፣ሶበ**). It is used exactly like **አመ** = “in the time of”, with Genitive following, and it may even subordinate an entire sentence in the Genitive relation: **ጊዜ ፡ ፈቀድኻመ** (“the time of—you will”) “whenever you will” Mark 14, 7: and hence it is on the way to become a Conjunction, just as **ሶበ** is nearly

(¹) As to the form **በዕብሬትከ** *ἐπὶ σοι*, Judges 11, 23, it is certainly better to regard it as standing for **ክብሬት** from **በረዩ**. [FIELD’s LXX (Oxford 1859) gives *ἐπὶ σοῦ* here. TR.]

(²) [*Cf.* **Kebra Nag.**, *Introd.* p. XVII.]

(³) **ዜ** as in **ይእዚ**, **ማእዚ**.

always a Conjunction. But just as we say **ይአተ : ሰቤ**, we also say **ውአተ : ጊዜ**, **ይአተ : ጊዜ** “at that time” Matt. 21,2; Ps. 18,14; or **ጊዜሃ**, **በጊዜሃ** “forthwith”, “at that time”, just like **አሚሃ**, **ሰቤሃ** Matt. 14, 27; 21, 3 &c.

On **ሴዛ ስፔሶ**, **አፕቲ**, **ፑሪ**, and **ፍዳ** *pro*, **አፕቲ** v. DILLMANN'S ‘*Lex.*’, coll. 538, 1380.

Attachment
of
Suffixes to
Prepo-
sitions.

§ 167. *Attachment of Suffixes to Prepositions.* Almost all the Prepositions may take the Personal Pronoun as a Suffix, just as, with the Constr. St., they govern Nouns. But the manner of attachment varies greatly, corresponding to the origin and use of the Preposition.

1. The two quite short and exceedingly common Prepositions, **በ** and **ለ**, follow a way of their own.

(a) **ለ** attracts the Suffixes of the 2nd Pers. *m.* and *f.*, and the Plural Suffixes of all the Persons, without any binding-vowel, but yet in such a manner that *la* with **ሆሙ** and **ሆን** is contracted into **ሎሙ** and **ሎን**. The suffix of the 1st Pers. Sing. was appended, in accordance with § 149, in its oldest form **፲**, to **ለ**, or rather to **ል**, becoming **ሊ**. In the same way the Singular Suffixes of the 3rd Pers. with **ለ** brought about the contracted forms **ሎ** and **ላ** ⁽¹⁾. But these forms **ሊ**, **ሎ**, **ላ** were ere long considered too short, and were therefore strengthened by a repetition of the attachment of Personal signs,—in the 3rd Person by **ቱ** and **ቲ** (as in **ውአቱ**, **ይአቲ**), and in the 1st by **ተ**, which in this case must be explained as standing for **ኀ** of **አኀ** “I” ⁽²⁾. We have therefore (TRUMPP, p. 560):

1.	2.	3.
<i>m.</i>	<i>f.</i>	<i>m.</i>
S. ሊተ “to me”; ለከ , ለከ “to thee”; ሎቱ “to him”, ላቲ “to her”;		
Pl. ለኀ “to us”; ለከሙ , ለከን “to you”; ሎሙ “to them”, ሎን “to them”.		

Instead of **ሎን**, met with *e. g.* in Matt. 24, 19; Hen. 9, 8 ⁽³⁾, a form **ሎንቱ** is found, having **ቱ** appended (just as in **አሎንቱ**,

(1) **ኀ**, **ኀ**, **ኀ**.—**ሎቲ** 4 Esr. 6, 62 (KÖNIG, p. 124) is manifestly an error of the Press.

(2) Just as the Personal-ending of the 1st pers. Perf. in Arabic and in the North-Semitic tongues is *tu*, *ti*; cf. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 105, *e*; ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ I, p. 285 sq.

(3) [FLEMMING’S reading of this verse, besides exhibiting other differences, gives **ሎንቱ** instead of DILLMANN’S **ሎን**. TR.]

አላንቱ) Ex. 26, 4, 37; Gen. 31, 43, and another form **ሎቶን** for **ሎንቶን**, having **ቶን** appended (as in **ውአቶን**). Some rather peculiar Suffixes also are taken by **ለ** when it is compounded with **ወይ** and **አሌ** (§ 61, cf. DILLMANN's '*Lex.*'): besides **ወይሊት** "woe's me", one says farther **ወይልዩ** (for **ወይሊ**; cf. **ብዩ** for **ቢ**); and so too **አሌልዩ** (for **አሌሊ**) as well as **አሌሊት**; and in the 3rd Person **ቱ** is sometimes dropped, as in **አሌ : ሎ** Job 31, 3; **አሌሎ : ለውአቱ : ብእሲ** Matt. 18, 7; **አሌሎን : ለከናፍረ : ጉሕሉት** Ps. 30, 21; Matt. 24, 19. It is otherwise in the case of **ወይለከ**, **ወይለኪ**, **አሌ : ለከሙ** &c.

(b) Suffixes are attached to **በ** by *a* going back to *e*; only, in the 3rd Person *a* blends with *hū*, *hā* &c. into *ō*, *ā*, *ōmū*, *ōn*, thus (TRUMPP, p. 560):

1.	2.	3.
	m.	f.
S. ብዩ "in me";	ብከ, ብኪ "in thee";	ቦ "in him", ባ "in her";
Pl. ብን "in us";	ብከሙ, ብክን "in you";	ቦሙ "in them", ቦን "in them".

Yet **ቦቱ**, **ባቲ** also occur in place of **ቦ**, **ባ** (like **ሎቱ**, **ላቲ**), and **ቦንቱ** also, in place of **ቦን**, as in Josh. 24, 31; Matt. 25, 16; Numb. 13, 28; 14, 34; farther **ቦቶን** just like **ሎቶን**, as in Numb. 32, 17; finally even **ቢዩ** instead of **ብዩ** Sap. 2, 13 (A=Abb. 55). Another trace of an original **ቢ** "in me" has been preserved in **እንቢ** for the usual **እንብዩ**, § 162. Moreover **በ** when provided with Suffixes, although it has not yet given up its fundamental meaning, has usually assumed quite peculiar significations, and is with great frequency employed in these. 1. In particular, —inasmuch as (§ 194) the Copula "is" is already involved in **ብዩ** &c., **ብዩ**, **ብከ** &c. may signify: "it is with me" ⁽¹⁾, *i. e.* "I have", "thou hast", "he has", *e. g.* **ዘብከ** "that which thou hast". Therefore in many cases this form takes the place of our verb "to have", and is (§ 176, *h*) almost always construed with the Accusative, *e. g.* **አበ : ብን** "a father have we" Matt. 3, 9. 2. The 3rd pers. Sing. Masc. **ቦ** or **ቦቱ** may also signify: "therein (is)", *i. e.* "there is present", "there is *or* there are", corresponding in meaning, completely, to the **שׁוּ** of the Hebrews, *e. g.* **ቦ : እለ : በጽሑ** "there are those who came" "there came some". The word is always imper-

(¹) For this use of **በ** cf. passages like Hen. 37, 5 **ኮኑ : ብዩ** "they fell to my share".

sonal in that case, and its subject may be mentioned either in the Nominative or the Accusative, v. § 192. To give the negative of **ብ** in these two significations, the negative **ኣል** (ኃእ), which is now preserved only in this compound, was prefixed to it even in the oldest times (§ 62, *c*), whence⁽¹⁾:—

1.		2.	
		m.	f.
Sing.	ኣልብዩ	ኣልብከ	ኣልብከ.
Plur.	ኣልብኑ	ኣልብከሙ	ኣልብከን
		3.	
	m.		f.
Sing.	ኣልቦ or ኣልቦቱ	ኣልባ or ኣልባቲ	
Plur.	ኣልቦሙ	ኣልቦን or ኣልቦንቱ	

2. Of the other Prepositions, some have continued to exhibit various peculiarities, just because they are of Pronominal origin. The Preposition **እስከ** “till”, and **እንተ** (§ 166, No. 19) do not take any Suffixes,—the former, because it is properly a Conjunction and signifies “till that”, “until”,—and **እንተ**, because the use of it with Suffixes is reserved to indicate the Possessive (§ 150, *b*). On the other hand **በእንተ** “by reason of”, “for the sake of” permits the approach of Suffixes, and indeed does so quite in accordance with § 150, *b*⁽²⁾, thus: **በእንቲአዩ**, **በእንቲአሁ** &c. Finally **ከመ** “like”, originally a Conjunction too, calls for the appearance always of a long *ā* (from **መ** = **ጠፃ**) before the Suffixes (**ጠፃ**, **ጠፃን**):—

1.		2.		3.	
		m.	f.	m.	f.
Sing.	ከማዩ	ከማከ	ከማከ.	ከማሁ	ከማሃ
Plur.	ከማኑ	ከማከሙ	ከማከን	ከማሁሙ	ከማሁን.

ከማሁ farther stands in many cases for “such a one”, and as a neuter (“like it”) for “such a thing”, and for “thus” (§ 157, 1).

3. The majority of the other Prepositions take the ending *ē* before Suffixes instead of *a*. This can only be explained as a trace of the old ending of the Constr. St. in *ia* (§ 144), which has clung more tenaciously to these forms, manifestly because they are

(1) Corresponding in use in manifold ways to **لَيْسَ** and **אין**.

(2) [—including the lengthening of the **አ** before the suffixes in old Mss.]

all in the Accusative as well, and the old ending of the Constr. St. *ia* has coalesced with the *a* of the Accusative into *ē*⁽¹⁾. And this *ē* is preserved in a remarkable way with many prepositions, even in cases when they have nothing but an ordinary noun following them (*cf.* DILLMANN's '*Octateuch*', *Apparat. Crit.* p. 5): **ኅበ** Josh. 10, 4, Note; **መንገሌ** Numb. 20, 19, Note; **እምኔ** Lev. 20, 5 F; **እስኬ**⁽²⁾ Gen. 35, 20 F; Amos 6, 15 (A); 8, 12(A); **ምዕራሃ** 4 Kings 7, 18; **ዘእንበሌ** Matt. 15, 38 (Rom.); **ሀየቲ** Gen. 47, 19 F; **ሀየንቴዝ** Gen. 44, 33 F; **ዲቤ** Matt. 14, 26, 28 (Old); **መጠኔ** Sap. 12, 20 (A); and frequently in the N. T. (Old Ed.) &c.; *cf. supra* § 166, No. 38 **አሜ, ሶቤ**. This form appears always before Suffixes, *e. g.* from **ምስለ** "with":—

	1.		2.		3.
		m.	f.	m.	f.
Sing.	ምስሌየ	ምስሌከ	ምስሌከ.	ምስሌሁ	ምስሌሃ
Plur.	ምስሌነ	ምስሌክሙ	ምስሌክን	ምስሌሆሙ	ምስሌሆን

It is the same with **እምነ, ዲበ, ኅበ, ቅድመ, ድኅረ, ላዕለ, መልዕልተ, መንገለ, ማእከለ, ታሕተ, መትሕተ, ሀየንተ, እንበለ**. And yet suffixes are also met with, attached without an *ē*, *e. g.* **እምኖሙ** "of them" Ex. 1, 7,—particularly to those prepositions which are still used on other occasions as substantives also:—**መትሕቱ** and **መትሕቶ** Josh. 7, 21, 22, Note; **መልዕልቶሙ** Gen. 7, 20; **መልዕልቶ** Hen. 89, 4; **እምታሕታ** G. Ad. 49, 9; **ማእከሎሙ** Ps. 54, 17; Matt. 18, 20; Numb. 17, 2; Lev. 26, 46.

4. The Preposition **ውስተ** "in" takes before Suffixes a new Abstract-form **ውስቴት** "the interior", "inside", and appends the Suffixes to this, like **በዕብራት**, thus: **ውስቴትከ, ውስቴትክሙ, ውስቴቱ, ውስቴታ, ውስቴቶሙ, ውስቴቶን**⁽³⁾. To the preposition **በበይነ** the Suffixes are applied as to an ordinary noun: Ex. 26, 9;

(1) Thus we can neither compare the binding-vowel of the Plural '—, which is found with many prepositions before the Suffix in Hebrew, as PHILIPPI, '*Wesen und Urspr. des St. c.*', p. 107, PRAETORIUS, ZDMG XXVII, p. 644, and TRUMPP, p. 560, N. 1—would have us do, nor even the *ē* of **ይእዜ, ማእዜ, ጊዜ**. —*Cf.* farther BARTH, ZDMG XLII, p. 348 *sqq.* [V. now PRAETORIUS, ZDMG LVI, p. 685 *sqq.*]

(2) [V. *supra* Note, § 165, p. 395.]

(3) The form **ውስቴት** in the Constr. St. is met with in RÜPPELL, II, 39, [and D. H. MÜLLER, '*Epigr. Denkm.*' p. 45].—On **ውስቴት** v. now also BARTH, ZDMG XLII, p. 348, N. 6.

36, 11; and to its Plural-form **በበይናት**, just as to ordinary plurals, viz., with **፣**: **በበይናቲሆሙ** &c.

5. **ዐውዶ** “around”, as if it were not yet a full preposition, assumes the Suffixes just like an ordinary noun in the Accusative:—**ዐውድዮ** Ps. 30, 16; **ዐውዶ** Mark 3, 34; **ዐውዳ** Josh. 21, 40; **ዐውዶን** Josh. 21, 39; 24, 33 &c.; and it is the same with **ማዕዶተ**, **መንጸረ** &c., or **አምሳለ**, **አንጸረ** (§ 153, 1), **ጥቃ**, **አፍኣ**, **ከዋላ** and others (§ 154, 2, *a*).

III. CONJUNCTIONS.

General
Account of
Conjunc-
tions.

§ 168. Several of those Words of Relation which have been adduced among the Prepositions, are also employed as Conjunctions, being either Prepositions originally, and Conjunctions only in a derived way, or *vice versâ*. In fact, when we consider that a Preposition is always in the Constr. St. relation, and farther that by means of this relation a word may govern an entire clause, whether it be introduced by a relative pronoun or not (*e. g.* **አም ጣነ ሀሎ ማርዓዊ ምስሌሆሙ** “in the measure [of this] that” —*i. e.* “so long as the bridegroom is with them” Mark 2, 19), the possibility of a Preposition passing into a Conjunction becomes clear; and several Conjunctions have been produced in this way. By the side of these, there are others which are originally mere Adverbs, but which have acquired the power, by a slight alteration of the sense or even of the form, of connecting clauses together. The most numerous Conjunctions, however, and the most current, are of pronominal origin, and come usually from a relative pronoun or a demonstrative pronoun used relatively, inasmuch as the relative pronoun is precisely the one which serves to bring words and clauses into relation with one another. Again, among Conjunctions themselves, one very essential distinction consists in this, that some of them hold the clause, which they introduce, in stricter subordination, while others only loosely precede it. Necessarily the former must stand invariably at the head of the sentence, and are either combined with relative pronouns or appear in the Constr. St. The latter are nothing but adverbs, and, therefore, like other adverbial particles, they readily retire behind the first word or words of the sentence, or they may even be attached to one of these in the form of an enclitic. Conjunctions are arranged, in what follows, in accordance with their signification.

1. COPULATIVE, DISJUNCTIVE, ADVERSATIVE, AND RESTRICTIVE CONJUNCTIONS.

1. The simplest Copula is **ወ** “and” (ወ, ወ), always attached to the word which follows. It connects both individual words and clauses, and corresponds frequently to our stronger “also”, and not seldom to our “but”, inasmuch as that which may be regarded in the one language as a simple continuation or ranking together, is expressed in the other rather as a contrast or opposition. It may even answer to our “or”, or “up to”, *e. g.* “two *and* three” for “two *or* (‘up to’) three”, Hen. 3. Still, there are special particles, in common use, for “also”, “but” and “or”.

1. Copulative,
Disjunctive,
Adversative
and
Restrictive
Conjunctions (1—9).

2. **ከው** “or” (ከ, ከ, ከ⁽¹⁾) is sometimes disjunctive, sometimes explanatory; but for “or” in the sense of “that is” there is also a periphrasis with **ብሂል** (§ 193), and in like manner there are still other expressions for “or” as ‘*sive*’ (§ 170).

3. For the idea, “also”, “even”, the peculiar word **ሂ** is made use of, always enclitic like **ጥ፩** and **que**, an adverb of the shortest formation from the root **ሀ**⁽²⁾ (§ 62), *e. g.* **መጽብሐውያንሂ** “even the publicans” Matt. 5, 46; **ከንተሂ** “even (or ‘also’) thou” Matt. 18, 33; **እለሂሰ** “even those, which he hath” Matt. 13, 12. It serves also to link words together, and then it is equivalent to “and”, *e. g.* **እሴስዩክሙ : ለቤትክሙሂ** “I will nourish you and your house” Gen. 50, 21. Most frequently it occurs in association with **ወ**, **ወ—ሂ** “and also”, “farther”, “and”: **ወእንስሳሂ** “and (also) the beasts” Gen. 1, 26; **ወሰበሂ : ትጼልዩ** “and when ye pray” Matt. 6, 5. In all such cases it connects individual words as well as whole clauses. It is often made use of to turn the interrogatives **መኑ** and **ምንት** into indefinites (§ 147, *b*)⁽³⁾, but only in clauses which have a negative meaning.

4. A somewhat stronger conjunction than **ሂ** is found in **ኒ**, formed from the root **ኑ**, just as **ሂ** is from the root **ሀ**⁽⁴⁾. It may indeed be translated frequently by “also”, but more precisely it

(1) Also = **ከ** G. Ad. p. 110, line 7 and Note 2.

(2) If not rather a weakened form from an interrogative root *kwi*, *ki*.

(3) Like **चित्त** and **चन**.

(4) —*ni* has also been found in Assyrian; v. HAUPT, ‘*Der keilinschr. Sintfluthbericht*’ (Leipzig 1881), p. 29, [and DELITZSCH, ‘*Assyr. Gramm.*’ § 79, *β*].

answers to “on his part”, “on the other hand”, for it is the proper particle to express the correspondence of two or more members, whether words or clauses, in cases where the relation of reciprocity occurs. In Greek we should most readily express it by *μέν* or *δέ*: “whatsoever ye would that men should do to you **ግበሩ ለሙ፡ አንተሙኒ** even so do ye to them on your part” Matt. 7, 12; “if ye forgive men their trespasses **የጎድግ ለክሙኒ ለቡክሙ** your Father will also forgive you”, Matt. 6, 14, 15; **በክሙ፡ በሰማይ፡ ወበምድርኒ** “as in heaven, so also upon earth” Matt. 6, 10. Thus the combination **ው—ኒ** is very often equivalent to *δέ*, when anything new is added: **ወከህናትኒ** “and the priests again” (‘on their part’) &c. Josh. 6, 13, 14; 9, 3; *cf.* especially the instructive passage Matt. 13, 37—39: “the sower is the Son of Man; **ወገራህቱኒ** *the field again* is the world; **ወሠናይኒ ፡ ዘርእ** *while the good seed* are the children of the kingdom” &c. When two or more members of a sentence are strung together by **ኒ**, **ው—ኒ**, this arrangement answers to our “as well—as”, “both—and”: **ወወፅኡ ፡ እሙንቱኒ ፡ ወነገሥቶሙኒ** “and they went out, both themselves and their kings” Josh. 11, 4; or **እምኩለሂኒ ፡ የዐርግ ፡ ወእምህየኒ ፡ ጠል** “as on all other sides, so on this side too the dew arose” Hen. 28, 2; in the same way **ኒ ፡ ወ**, *e. g.* **ውእቱኒ ፡ ወእለ ፡ ምስሌሁ** “both he and they that were with him” Matt. 12, 3; or **ሂ ፡ ው—ኒ** Gen. 42, 35. **ኒ** is also appended to the interrogative, just like **ሂ** and with the same object; but **መኩ** more readily takes **ሂ**⁽¹⁾, and **ምንት**, **ኒ**⁽²⁾.

5. The notion “but”, if it has no special emphasis, is regularly expressed by **ሰ**, which likewise appears invariably as an enclitic. It comes from the root **ሰ**⁽³⁾ (§ 62, 1, *a*), and means in the first place “there”. “But” is by no means its fundamental meaning. It is rather attached to a word for the purpose of bringing it emphatically into notice; and thereby peculiar delicacy and brevity are lent to Ethiopic diction. *E. g.*: “Take no thought for the morrow, **እስመ ፡ ጌሠምሰ ፡ ትሒሊ ፡ ለርእሳ** for *the morrow* will take thought for itself” Matt. 6, 34; **እመ ፡ ወልዱሰ ፡ አንተ ፡ ለእግዚአ**

(1) Because **መኩኒ** would be uneuphonious.

(2) When **ኒ** encounters the final **ን** of a noun, there is usually no contraction (§ 55, *c*), *e. g.* Lev. 25, 22; Deut. 2, 23, 29 (*cf.* § 161, *a*); *v.*, however, Numb. 6, 4.

(3) Quite similar are **अथ**, **तु**, *δέ*.—

ብሔር “If thou be (really) the Son of God” Matt. 4, 3; Gen. 4, 25; Matt. 3, 15; 6, 9; 21, 13; Josh. 23, 2; Hen. 15, 7⁽¹⁾; 16, 3 &c. Hence it answers to *μέν*, wherever this particle gives a degree of prominence: **ማእረሩሰ : ብዙኅ : ወገባሩ : ኅዳጣን** *ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι* Matt. 9, 37; **ቃልሰ : ቃለ : ያዕቆብ : ወእደው : ዘኔሳው** Gen. 27, 22; and it stands both for *μέν* and for *δέ*, *e. g.* in John 3, 29, 30. On the position of **ሰ** in the sentence, *cf.* **ወእለ : ይኤብሱሰ** Tob. 12, 10, where later manuscripts present **ወእለሰ : ይኤብሱ**. In order to produce a specially marked emphasis, it may even be attached to more than one word in the sentence: **እም ዮምሰ : እንከሰ : ያፈቅረኒ** “now from this day he will assuredly love me” Gen. 30, 20. When it actually expresses merely our “but” or the Greek particle of continuation or opposition, *δέ*, it is then frequently joined with the additional particle **ወ**, thus **ወ—ሰ**, *e. g.* **ወእመሰ** “but if”⁽²⁾.

6. Contrast or contrariety is expressed more strongly, and almost always after clauses of negative meaning, by **አላ** “but” (*sondern*), “but rather”, formed from **ላ** = **ሂ** (§ 62) and **እም** = **እም** “if” (§ 170)⁽³⁾. It is used pretty often, and it always stands at the beginning of the clause, *e. g.* “man does not live by bread alone, **አላ : በኩሉ : ቃል** but by every word” Matt. 4, 4. It appears in the sense of “if not”, *Chrest.* p. 4, line 21; p. 92, line 13. In translations from Arabic it also corresponds to **ሂ** “except”, *e. g.* **አላ : እም** “excepting if” (‘unless’) G. Ad. 148, 1.

7. **እንበለ** and **ዘእንበለ** (§ 166, No. 23) are often used also

(¹) [The appended **ሰ** does not appear in the reading which FLEMMING adopts here. TR.]

(²) On **ገሰኩ** (**ገሰኩ**) v. DILLMANN'S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 1056 *sq.*, and *cf.* PRAETORIUS, ‘*Beitr. z. Assy.*’ I, p. 26.

(³) Formed thus like **ሂ**. NÖLDEKE is of a different opinion. In a letter dated 4th Dec., 1882, he explains **አላ** as *ἀλλά*, which according to him has pushed its way into Ethiopic, through the Coptic, where it is in full use (*cf.* STERN'S ‘*Gramm.*’). Against any comparison with **ሂ** the same scholar lays stress upon these facts,—that *lā* is not otherwise attested in Ge‘ez,—that *m* and *n* are not progressively assimilated in Ge‘ez,—and that the Semitic particles for the idea “if” constantly contain *i* (**ሰ** = **ሰ** = **ወእ**).

in a like meaning, after a negation: Matt. 9, 12; 16, 23; Mark 7, 15; Ps. 43, 5.

8. **ባሕቱ** (§ 163, 2), which properly signifies “only”, is also frequently employed to express “yet”, “but rather”, “but”. It is, in that case, usually placed after another word, mostly the leading word upon which stress is laid: **አግብኩ፡ ባሕቱ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር** “but rather render ye to God” Matt. 5, 33; **ይኩን፡ ባሕቱ፡ ነገርከሙ** “rather let your speech be” Matt. 5, 37; 10, 6; **እለ፡ ኢኮኑ፡ ባሕቱ፡ እምነኝ** “but yet who are not of us” 1 John 2, 19. When compounded with **ወ** as **ወባሕቱ**, it expresses “but” (*sondern*): **ወባሕቱ፡ ዑቁ** “but take heed” Matt. 6, 1; 8, 4; **ወባሕቱ፡ እብለክሙ** “but I say unto you” Matt. 8, 11; **ወባሕቱ፡ ፍርህህ** “but fear ye him (who)” &c. Matt. 10, 28; and also, separated from **ወ**, **ወእብለክሙ፡ ባሕቱ** “but I say unto you” Matt. 17, 12; and thus frequently. Farther **ሰ** may be added in the same clause: **ወእመሰ፡ ኢፈቀደት፡ ባሕቱ፡ ይእቲ፡ ብእሲት** “but if that woman be not willing” Gen. 24, 8; **ወባሕቱ፡ ለሊሁሰ፡ ኢየሱስ፡ ኢያጥመቅ** “but Jesus himself baptised not” John 4, 2.

9. On **ዳእሙ** “rather” (also in the combined form: **ዘእንበለ፡ ዳእሙ** “but rather” Mark 7, 15) v. § 163, 2.

2. INFERENTIAL, CAUSAL, AND FINAL CONJUNCTIONS.

2. Inferential, Causal and Final Conjunctions (1—10).

§ 169. 1. **ኬ** “now”, “thus”, denotes an inference. It is always enclitic, and is probably an abbreviated form of **ከ**, § 64, *b*. It is very common, particularly in the N. T., *e. g.*: **ወኩሎንኬ፡ ትውልድ** “and all the generations therefore are” &c. Matt. 1, 17; **አንሰኬ** “now I indeed” Matt. 3, 11. It is also appended to **አ**, to emphasise astonishment: **አኬመምህራን** “O what teachers!” The *k* of **ኬ** may be assimilated to the vowel-less **ግ** or **ቅ** of a verb: **እግድጌ** Gen. 33, 15.

2. In like manner **እንከ** is at first inferential, meaning “thus”, “now”, but afterwards having also the meaning “now then”, “forthwith”. It is always set after one of the first words in the clause, and is to be derived from **እን** and **ከ** (§ 64, *b*). The word is of very common occurrence, *e. g.* **ለምንት፡ እንከ፡ ትትመዐዑኒ** “why then are ye angry with me?” John 7, 23. It is often found along with **ኬ** with a meaning equivalent to “now therefore”, *e. g.* **ግበሩኬ፡ እንከ፡ ወናዩ፡ ፍሬ** “now therefore produce good fruits” Matt. 3, 8; 5, 13; 6, 31; 10, 26; 22, 9; or—it is strengthened by **ሰ**;—**ባእ፡ እን**

ከሰ : ኅበ : አመትዩ “go in therefore unto my maid” Gen. 16, 2; 29, 19, 21; Hen. 16, 4. It may even, when strengthened by other enclitics, introduce the sentence: **እንከሰኬ** Matt. 19, 6. When it is used with the Perfect or Imperfect, in narrative diction, and in combination with **ወ**, it indicates “and so”⁽¹⁾: **ወአኅዙ : እንከ** “and so they began” Hen. 86, 6; 93, 3; **ወያጌጉዎሙ : እንከ** “and he will (‘now’) forthwith urge them on” Hen. 62, 10; Ex. 5, 7, 10; 6, 7; 7, 5; or in certain connections it answers to our “again”, “more”: **አሐተ : እንከ** (‘once again’) “once more” Judges 16, 28. On **ኢ**—**እንከ** “no longer”, *οὐκέτι, μηκέτι* v. the ‘*Lex.*’

3. A similar compound, but somewhat different in meaning, is found in **እንጋ ἄρα**, which is usually set back in its clause, but which now and then introduces it. It occurs nearly always in questions, deriving from admitted assumptions consequences which may with probability be inferred: “then indeed?” “surely then indeed?” &c.: **መኑ : እንጋ : ያዐቢ** “who then indeed is the greatest?” Matt. 18, 1; **እንጋ : አግዳዝያንኑ : እሙንቱ : ውሉዶሙ** “are not then their children free?” Matt. 17, 26; or without an interrogative: **እንጋ : በጽሐት : ላዕሌከሙ : መንግሥት** “then surely the kingdom has come unto you” Matt. 12, 28.—V. also **መኑ : እንጋ** Matt. 19, 25; **ምንተ : እንጋ** Matt. 19, 27. A very good example occurs in **መኑ : እንጋ : ውእቱ : ዝንቱ** “what manner of man truly is this?” (namely ‘the man who can do the things which have been done by him’,—thus drawing an inference from his deeds) Matt. 8, 27. The shade of meaning, differentiating the word from **እንከ**, must lie in **ጋ**.—If **እንከ** is equivalent to “(there) see, that—” and to “accordingly”, “thus”, then **እንጋ** must be “see, indeed!” or “see, what!”. This explains such a use of the word as we have in Mark 1, 37: **እንጋ : ዙሉ : የኅሥሠክ** “all men seek then for thee”, where reference is made to a circumstance well-known which might have been taken into consideration even by the person addressed.

4. **እስመ** (from **ሰ** and **መ**, § 64, b)⁽²⁾ is causal, or justificative,

(1) Corresponding to the **ו** and **ו** *consecutivum* of the Hebrews.

(2) [PRAETORIUS compares **ስም** (سُم), ‘*Beitr. zur Assy.*’ I, p. 378, and R. KRAETZSCHMAR, *ibid.*, p. 442 Note*, the Assy. *aššu(m)*. JENSEN, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Assy.*’ XI, p. 352 (*l. c. supra*), explains **እስመ** from **en sema*, comparing **en* with the Assyrian *in(a)*.]

“because”, and “for”⁽¹⁾,—almost the only word for this idea, and so in very frequent use. Less frequently like *ἔτι* it is equivalent to “that” (conj.) (§ 203).

5. The Relative Pronoun, conceived as neuter, **ה**⁽²⁾, also stands for the conjunction “that” (‘so that’) and “because” or “since”.

6. The usual word for “that” is **הס**⁽³⁾ (‘according to that which’, ‘like as’), which is also employed as a preposition § 165, 6. It signifies “that”, “so that” as well as “in order that”; and in the latter case it must invariably be followed by the Subjunctive. Taken with **ל**, it signifies “that—not”, “in order that—not”, ‘lest’.

7. The preposition **ל** (§ 164, 2), which expresses the aim or object, is, like *ل* in Arabic, prefixed even to a whole clause, to express a Wish, a Command, or a Purpose. It is employed in independent clauses, and in dependent final-clauses (*cf.* DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’ col. 24 and *Hexaem.* 15, 3), and must always be followed by the Subjunctive, which it immediately precedes. Manifestly the whole following clause is dependent upon this **ל** in the Constr. St. It should properly be given as **ל****ה** “for this, that—”; but here, on account of the brevity of utterance in one who is giving a command or expressing a wish, **ה** is never used.

8. **לְה**, properly “till that” (also a preposition § 165, 5), is farther “so that”, *e. g.* Josh. 23, 5, 13. As, however, the word is already in frequent use as a preposition, it is again compounded with **ל**, as **לְה** : **ל** “until when”, also “so that”, *ἕως*, Matt. 8, 24, 28; 13, 2, 54; 15, 31 &c. In the *Hexaemeron* it often corresponds (joined to an Indicative or Subjunctive) to *حتى*, *e. g.* 5, 15; 9, 17; v. also G. Ad. 27, 11.

9. **לְל** and **לְל** (§ 166, 23) may also govern an entire clause, in the sense of “except that”, “without”, “so that not” (*ita ut non*): Matt. 10, 29 &c. (It should properly be given in fulness as **לְל**).

10. Finally, the word **ל**, which is so exceedingly obscure

(1) Just like **ו**, it combines the two.

(2) Like **ו**, **ו**, **ו**, **ו**, *quod*.

(3) Like *ἕως*, *ἕως*, **ל**, *ut*.—According to NÖLDEKE, GGA 1886, No. 26, p. 1013, **הס** “that” is different from **הס** “as” or “like” which is = **כ**, and is to be ranked with **כ**,—as in Tigrîna *כ* = **כ**, **כ**, plays a great rôle.

in its origin, belongs to this class. It corresponds often to our “perhaps”, and expresses doubt, uncertainty, or bare probability: **በኢያአምሮ : ከነ : የጊ** “peradventure it happened from oversight” Gen. 43, 12; 20, 11; Luke 11, 20. It is employed much more frequently, however, when the uncertainty farther awakens misgiving; and then it answers to the Greek *μήποτε*, the Hebrew *יִפְּ* and our “lest”: **የጊ : ይመጽእ : ዘይከብረከ** “lest haply there come some one, who is more honoured than thou” Luke 14, 8; **የጊ : አነ : እት ሀገጥል : ምስሌሃ** “that I perish not with it” Hen. 65, 3; **ወይእዚኒ : የጊ : ያሌዕል : እደሁ** “and now peradventure he will (*i. e.* ‘it is to be feared that he will’) stretch forth his hand” Gen. 3, 22; **የጊ : ትጊጊ** “thou mightest possibly fall into sin” Deut. 4, 19; Gen. 26, 9; Deut. 8, 12—14; Gen. 38, 11. It appears, accordingly, after verbs which express fear or wariness: **እፈርህ : የጊ : ኢትፈቅዱ** “I am afraid you will not be willing” Hen. 6, 3; **ዑቅ : የጊ** Rev. 22, 9. Accordingly the word must mean, properly: “it may be, that”, or “it is to be feared, that”⁽¹⁾.

3. CONJUNCTIONS EXPRESSING CONDITIONAL AND TEMPORAL RELATIONS.

§ 170. Ethiopic has to some extent the same words for both these relations, just like other languages.

1. From the interrogative and relative **መ** there have been derived, by prefixing an Aspirate (§ 64, *b*), the forms **አመ** and **እመ**, the former a Temporal particle, the latter a Conditional particle, —a distinction which is of a purely phonetic nature, and one which assuredly has been impressed only in process of time⁽²⁾. **አመ** “when”, “at the time that” is not very common, and its place is generally taken by **ሰበ**. When it does appear, it still keeps the full meaning of “at the time when” (*cf.* also § 161, *b*). It takes also the compound forms **እምአመ** “since”, *e. g.* Gen. 11, 10 (*et saepe*), and **እስከ : አመ** (*v. infra*). But in **ዘአመ** “when” (*e. g.* superscription

3. Conjunctions expressing Conditional and Temporal Relations (1—10).

⁽¹⁾ So that **ጊ** seems to be equivalent to **ኃ** (§ 64, *b*), but **የ** to be a form mutilated beyond recognition from some longer word, perhaps from an Optative of **ከነ**, **ከነ** (?), as if it were **ኃ ከነ** (?), or a weakened form of **ኃ**, **ኃ**, so that **የጊ** would properly be “if that” (**ኃ ኃ**). [**የጊ**, **የጊከ** *Kebrā Nag.* 25 Ann. 26 are hardly correct.]

⁽²⁾ *Cf.* **አላ** (‘if not’, ‘unless’) “but”.

of Ps. 3 &c.) **አመ** is a preposition placed after the relative (§ 164), and thus means properly at “the time (of this) that”. **አመ** “if”⁽¹⁾ is the ordinary conditional particle, and is employed whenever anything is posited as a fact or a possibility. Along with **ለ** it forms the compound **ለአመ** : (*lit.* ‘towards when’, *i. e.*) “in case that”, equivalent to **አመ** “if”, *e. g.* Ps. 45, 2; Gen. 15, 5; 18, 24; Matt. 11, 23. In a dependent interrogation both have the meaning, “if” or “whether”. “If not”, “whether—not” are expressed by the addition of the negative particle: **አመ** : **ኢ** or **ለአመ** : **ኢ**. “If even” or “although” is **አመሂ** (**ለአመሂ**) or **ወአመሂ**. The repetition of **አመሂ** or **አመሂ** signifies that two possibilities are set overagainst each other:—*sive—sive*; “it may be that—, or”, *e. g.* **አመሂ** : **ሐይወት** : **ወአመሂ** : **ሞት** 1 Cor. 3, 22; **አመሂ** : **እወ** : **ወአመሂ** : **አልቦ** Matt. 5, 37. And in certain situations **ወአመሂ** or **ወለአመ** may even by itself signify “or”: Matt. 12, 25; Hen. 59, 2⁽²⁾. But if “or” is meant in the sense of exclusion, *i. e.* as a Disjunctive, then the negative word **አኮ** “not” is combined with **አመ** to form **አመ** : **አኮ** or **አማአኮ**; and this combination signifies 1, “or” (*aut*), *e. g.* Luke 2, 24, and when it is repeated, like **አማአኮ** :—**ወአማአኮ** or **አማአኮሰ** :—**አማአኮሰ**, “either—or” (v. § 206); or 2, “when—not”, *i. e.* “otherwise”, “else” (*sin minus*): Mark 2, 21; Matt. 6, 1, 24 &c.

2. **አም** is a form, shortened from **አመ**, and generally to be found at the head of the apodosis of a Conditional clause which does not state actual fact⁽³⁾. It answers to the Greek *ἄν*⁽⁴⁾. As it has ceased to be a true conditional particle, and has only the function, in its place at the head of the apodosis, of indicating again that the whole sentence must be regarded as merely hypothetical, it is always attached to the beginning of another word (as in **አምነሰሐ** “they would have repented” Matt. 11, 21), and it is for this reason that the *a* of **አመ** has (generally) fallen away. Farther, **አመ** is also used in Optative clauses, if the realisation of the wish has to be represented as doubtful or improbable: **መኑ** : **አምከፈለኒ** “O that one would give me!”

(¹) **ጳጵ**, **ጴጢ**, **ጴጢ**.

(²) [FLEMMING here reads **ወአመ** instead of DILLMANN's **ወለአመ**. TR.]

(³) Yet see G. Ad. 54, 25 **አልቦ** : **ዘአምከኒ** “then would we not have been”, and *cf. ibid.* 55, 2.

(⁴) It is related to **አመ** just as *ἄν* is to *ἐάν* (*ei ἄν*).

3. **ሶበ** (§§ 62, 1 *a*; 166, No. 38),—properly “in the ‘there’”, “there”,—is chiefly used relatively, like our “since”, “as”, “when”, and is the ordinary Temporal particle. Now and then a farther form **ሶቤ** (§§ 166, No. 38; 167, 3) is met with in old manuscripts and printed matter, especially if enclitics are attached, *e. g.* **ሶቤሰ** “when however”; **ሶቤሁ** “when indeed”. In conditional sentences not stating actual fact **ሶበ** is employed as the conditional particle “if” ⁽¹⁾, with **እም** following in the apodosis. The transition to this meaning is represented by its use in Optative clauses, in which **ሶበ** was given for “would that sometime!” just as **መኑ** was for “would that some one!” (§ 199).

4. **እንበለ** and **ዘእንበለ** (properly: “if not”, “unless”, “except”, § 166, No. 23; and “without”, § 169, 9) are also used as Temporal conjunctions: “when not yet”, “before”, and are then associated with the Subjunctive (§ 90); so too, more in the sense of a condition, “unless when”, “unless”, “except”, Matt. 19, 9, 11; **ዘእንበለ : እመ** “excepting if”, “except”, Matt. 12, 29.

5. **እንዘ** “while”, “whilst” has the same rôle in the department of Conjunctions that **እንተ** ⁽²⁾ (§ 166, No. 19) has among Prepositions. The prefix **እን** (“there!”, “see!”) puts the relative conjunction **ዘ** “that” in the Accusative as it were,—with the object of bringing the whole clause, which is thus introduced, into subordination to the verb of the principal clause, as an Accusative of limitation, or as a circumstantial clause: “seeing that”, “in or by this (fact, manner, or circumstance) that”. This **እንዘ** is used very often indeed, to take the place of Participles which are wanting (exactly like the German *indem*), or even with the force of the Gerund (§ 123), and frequently instead of it, when for special reasons it is inconvenient to form or employ the Gerund. It corresponds often to our “although”, particularly after negatives or in negative sentences, *e. g.* “he ate nothing costly **እንዘ : ባዕል : ውእቱ** while yet he (‘although he’) was rich”; or Matt. 13, 13.

6. **እስከ** “until that”, “until” (also **እስከኒ** § 160), is also used as a Conjunction of Time, but it appears more frequently in the form **እስከ : እመ** “till when”, “until” Matt. 2, 13, 15; also “so long as” Cant. 3, 5; or **እስከ : ሶበ** “till that”, “until” Matt. 2, 9; 5, 18, 26.

(1) It corresponds then to ነፃ, ንፃ.

(2) Which itself in turn appears as a Conjunction, though seldom.

7. **እምከመ**, and more rarely **ለእምከመ** and **ለእመ : ከመ**, from **እመ** and **ከመ**, stand for “as soon as”, Matt. 5, 23; 9, 21 &c.: v. DILLMANN’S ‘*Lex.*’ col. 829, *sq.*

8. Original Prepositions, which are employed as Conjunctions without being followed by any Relative, are met with in **እም ድኅረ** “after that” (occurring very frequently); and **እምቅድመ** “before”, “ere”; also **ቅድመ**, the two last-mentioned being joined with the Subjunctive (§ 90). Farther we meet with **መጠነ**, **እም ጣነ** and **በእምጣነ** “as long as”, *e. g.* Mark 2, 19; Matt. 9, 15; Gal. 4, 1; Ps. 103, 34 (v. §§ 166, 35; and 157, 1).

9. Compounds of the Relative **ዘ** are found in **እምዘ** “from the time that”, *i. e.* “after that”, Hen. 6, 1; Matt. 20, 8; Gen. 24, 22, and **በዘ** “while” (= **እንዘ**), “when”, Gen. 24, 36; 40, 15.

10. Besides, various other Prepositions and Substantives may be employed as Conjunctions too, taking then the Constr. St. In these cases **ዘ** is sometimes added, sometimes omitted: **ጊዜ** “when”, “whenever” (*lit.* “the time of”), Mark 14, 7; **ሆየንተ : ዘ** “instead of” Josh. 24, 20; or **ሆየንተ : ጳመወ** “for the reason that he had toiled”; **ተውላጠ : ሴሰይዎ** Enc. Mag. 8 “as they had fed him”; **በእንተ : ዘ** “for the reason that”, “because”, Hen. 13, 2; Gen. 6, 6; Mark 1, 44, “for this,—that” (*pro eo ut*) Gen. 29, 27, and several others.

Prevalence
and Force
of Prefix-
and Affix-
Particles in
Ethiopic.

§ 171. A survey of the Adverbs, Prepositions and Conjunctions shows us that Ethiopic contains a large number of small words, which have lost the power of standing alone, and are attached to other and stronger words, either as Prefixes or Affixes. Attachment by way of Prefix is current in the other Semitic languages too. Here it affects **ዝ** and **ዘ** among the Pronouns. Similarly,—among the Particles,—it affects the very short monosyllables (but those only), which are too feeble to stand alone or to sustain any accent of their own, namely the Prepositions **በ**, **ለ**, **እም**, the Conjunctions **ለ**, **ወ**, **ዘ**, **እም**, the Negative **ኢ**; the Interrogative **ሚ**; and the Interjection **ኦ** ⁽¹⁾. This last particle, however, may sometimes be appended instead of being prefixed. These particles unite with the word which they begin, in taking one accent for the combination. It is only when they have long vowels

(1) And those particles also which now occur only in compounds: **እን**, **ኦል**, **ኦ** &c.

that a kind of independent accent is maintained. But yet, their connection with the word is not so close as to influence the phonetic conditions. The final and the initial letters in the particle and the word, which thus meet together, continue unchanged, except that in certain cases **ኣ** makes its influence more strongly felt upon the initial sound in the word which follows it (§ 48, 5).

All such particles, however, are treated as prefixes in Ethiopic, only because by their very conception they are bound to stand either at the head of the clause or in front of the word which they introduce⁽¹⁾. But when the case is otherwise, and a particle appears in its conception to be subordinate, and to be a mere addition to the leading idea, it is characteristic of Ethiopic to place such particle after the word which contains the leading idea, or to append it thereto as an Enclitic (or Affix). Nearly all the more subtle and ingenious particles,—which express with ease and brevity the chief modes and proportions of thought, or merely impart certain shades of meaning to the more definite ideas,—are, in accordance with their subordinate significance, placed last. They do not on that account disappear, or lose anything of the importance which belongs to them; but the current of discourse becomes more easy and accommodating, and the whole more lucid, by the finer or accessory ideas seeking to withdraw themselves, and appearing only as a lightly applied shading of the leading forms in the sentence. We see, it is true, from stray phenomena in the other Semitic languages, that they too possess the faculty of post-positing certain words; but no other Semitic tongue has made so extensive a use of such faculty as the Ethiopic. By applying that principle almost universally, it has made a decided and manifest advance; it has drawn nearer to the Indo-European tongues; and it has gained much for the ease and flexibility of its Syntax. **እንከ**, **እንጋ**, **ባሕቱ** are nearly always made to follow; often also **ዳኣሙ**; and **ከሙ** and **እስኩ** always. **ኒ**, **ሂ**, **ኔ**, **ሄ**, **ከ**, **ሁ**, **ኑ**, **ሙ**, **ነ**, **ሰ**, **ኣ**, **ሶ**, **ሃ** are Enclitics only, and **ኣ** not unfrequently. But as in other languages, so also in Ethiopic, enclitics are only attached externally, and, as a rule, they cause no change in the phonetic conditions of the word to

⁽¹⁾ One or two prepositions, however, are found transgressing the law now stated, by here and there becoming suffixed, at least to Pronouns, just as in the Indo-European tongues.

which they are applied. Nor are the accentual conditions of the word altered by that application, *cf.* TRUMPP, p. 559; but v. § 59. It is only a few enclitics that introduce any alterations in the letters. It has already been indicated (§ 142) how the **አ** of the Vocative is applied. Before **ሰ**, **አነ** *ána* “I” regularly foregoes its second *a*; and thus we have constantly **አንሰ**. It very seldom happens, or never, that any other words, having similar phonetic conditions, give up their final *a* before **ሰ**⁽¹⁾; for if in Deut. 11, 27, 28 **በረከትሰ** and **ወመርገምሰ** stand dependent upon a verb (v. 26), this may be explained by § 143⁽²⁾. Before **አ**, in the sense of **፤ቲ** (§ 162), an original *ē* occasionally re-appears instead of a final *a* (§ 167, 3): **መንገሌአ** Numb. 20, 19 Note; **ኅሌአ**: Josh. 10, 4 Note; or *a* is lengthened into *ā*: **መንገላአ** Numb. 20, 19 Note⁽³⁾; or it is thrown off: **አማእኮሰአ** Numb. 20, 18 Note; *cf.* 2 Kings, 2, 5; 4 Kings, 5, 26; 19, 29. In like manner an original final *ē*, which had in later times become *a*, re-appears readily besides, before suffixes and affixed particles, as in **ሶበ** (§ 170, 3), **አመ**, **መጠነ** &c. (§ 167, 3).

These particles, attached to the beginning or the end of a word, may occur not only singly, but by two, three or more at a time, *e. g.* **ወለእመሰኬ** “and if now”; **ወበዘእምሕዝብኒ** “and again with him who (is) of the people”; **አንሰኬ** “now I”; **ወኩልሄኒ** “and even everywhere” &c.

(1) [*Cf.*, however, **ፈድፋድሰ** for **ፈድፋድሰ** *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XXXIV.]

(2) And in this way we must also explain Col. 1, 23 **ተሠዩምኩ : ዐዋዴ** (though PLATT gives **ዐዋዲ** : [retained also in the Reprint]) **ወላእክሂ** (*cf.* Col. 1, 25; Eph. 3, 7). In **ይትፌሥሐኒ : ልብዩ** Ps. 12, 6, **ኒ** is certainly to be regarded as a Suff. Pron. (contrary to LUDOLF's view).

(3) *Cf.* *ā* in Bilin, Quara, Saho, and ‘Afar; REINISCH, ‘*Wörterb. d. Bilinspr.*’ p. 1.

PART THIRD.

SYNTAX.

§ 172. Every Sentence, however simple, must necessarily include (1) a Person or Thing, called the *Subject*, about which something is stated, and (2) that which is stated about it, or,—as it is called,—the *Predicate*. When both these parts are present, we have a complete Sentence; when one or the other is wanting, the Sentence is incomplete. But, starting with these two constituents, a Sentence may extend more and more widely, and to great length, by accumulating other words either about the Subject or about the Predicate or about both,—which words may in their turn surround themselves with still farther words, and so on. All such members of a Sentence, grouping themselves about the one or the other of the two fundamental constituents, must indicate in some way that they belong to the same; and *Syntax*, or the Description of the Sentence, is just an endeavour to point out in detail the modes in which, and the means by which, a fundamental member of a Sentence may become associated with other words and qualifications. Simple Sentences themselves fall, in their turn, into various classes, according to their special meaning. Finally, two Sentences,—each complete in itself, may stand in a certain relation of reciprocity to one another, so that the thought which seeks expression can be fully exhibited only when the two are used together, and not by either of them without the other. Accordingly the Compound Sentence stands contrasted with the Simple Sentence, as a special class. Syntax then deals first of all with the extension of the chief members of the Sentence by means of complementary members, or with the chief Word-Groups of the Sentence.

Subject
and
Predicate.
Periphrasis
of the
Article :
1. Methods
of indicating
Definiteness
in the
Noun.

A. LEADING WORD-GROUPS OF THE SENTENCE.

In all kinds of *Word-Groups* we have Nouns occurring; and as the structure of these groups at times assumes a different form, according as the Nouns which appear therein are determined or undetermined, we shall treat first of the methods by which this determination is effected.

I. PERIPHRAISIS OF THE ARTICLE.

No special Article has been developed in Ethiopic, any more than in the other Abyssinian tongues⁽¹⁾ or in Assyrian; and in this way the language has kept to a more antique stage than the other Semitic tongues, with the exceptions noted⁽²⁾. Various devices and methods have, naturally, presented themselves, to distinguish between the Noun determined or definite and the Noun in its indeterminate condition. All continues, however, still unsettled, as in the start of a process. None of the pathways pursued has led to the production of a fixed and recognised Article.

1. In many cases there is no need of any addition, to show that a word is determined or definite, because the sense and connection make it obvious who or what is meant, and no doubt can arise. Any conception, or conceptional word, which stands as the sole representative of its class, must, from its very nature, be invariably a determined word, such as አምላክ "God"; ፀሐይ "the Sun"; ሞት "Death"; ሕይወት "Life"; ምሥራቅ "the East". It is, on the other hand, when these words have to be regarded as undetermined, and as representing one or other of their special classes, that some special appositional expression has to be employed, *e. g.* ሞት : እኩይ "an evil death"; አምላክ : ነኪር "a strange god". In the very same way, all Proper Names are by their nature determined. Again, in other languages the definite article is frequently employed to refer to something which has been already mentioned, *e. g.* "the man", namely, 'the man who has been spoken of before'. But it is generally quite clear from the current or

(1) With the exception of *Saho*.

(2) On the other hand D. H. MÜLLER, '*Epigr. Denkm.*' p. 68 (*cf.* pp. 20, 72) would conclude, from the occurrence of the appended Sabaic Article *ān*, that Ge'ez at one time also possessed the Article, but has since given it up,—a view in which we are unable to concur.

connection of the discourse, when the same Subject is meant which has been mentioned before; and accordingly the referring article may in that case be dispensed with; *e. g.* in Matt. 4, 25 we have: “many people followed him” (**አሕዛብ፡ ብዙኃን**), immediately after which Chap. 5, 1 proceeds with **ወርእዮ፡ አሕዛብ** “and when he saw the people”,—without any farther intimation that the word is determined, just because that determination is at once inferred. In other cases, in which languages that possess the Article make use of it, it is all the more superfluous when the complement, by means of which the word having the Article is really determined, stands close beside the word, *e. g.* in **ሕዝብ፡ እስራኤል** “the people of Israel”; **መንግሥተ፡ ሰማያት** “the kingdom of Heaven”.

(a) But should the sense and the connection be insufficient to prevent any misunderstanding, Ethiopic is able to come to the rescue in various ways. First, by adding the referring Pronoun **ውእቱ**⁽¹⁾:—*καὶ ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τῶν λείθων τοῦ τόπου* **ውነሥኦ፡ እምውእቱ፡ እብን፡ ዘውእቱ፡ ብሔር** Gen. 28, 11; *καὶ ὑψώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος* **ወተለዐለ፡ ውእቱ፡ ብእሷ** Gen. 26, 13; *cf.* also Tob. 6, 2, 3, 13; 12, 5; *Chrest.* p. 26, lines 8, 11, 29, *et saepe*; or by **ዝክቱ** when the preceding mention of the word lies somewhat farther back, *e. g.* Gen. 27, 16; Numb. 20, 8 (*cf.* with verse 9); Ruth 4, 1; very frequently by means of **ዝኩ**, *e. g.* Tob. 6, 4, 6, 13; 8, 2, 3; 11, 3, 5, 7; 12, 1; also by means of **ዝ**, Tob. 6, 4; 11, 3; and by **ዝንቱ** Tob. 6, 16; 12, 2. The same purpose is often still better served by appending a Suffix Pron., *e. g.* *καὶ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταί* (“the disciples”, *i. e.* ‘Christ’s disciples’) **ቀርቡ፡ አርዳኢሁ** Matt. 18, 1; **ክልኤሆሙ፡ አኅው** “the two brethren” Matt. 20, 24 (while **ክልኤቱ፡ አኅው** would be “two brethren”, *cf.* Matt. 20, 30); and even *ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐκείνῳ* **በዓመቲሁ** “in the year thereof” Deut. 14, 28; **እስመ፡ ፈጸምኩ፡ መዋዕሊሁ** *πεπλήρωνται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι μου* Gen. 29, 21; **እምነ፡ በለስ፡ አእምሩ፡ አምሳሊሁ** *ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν* Matt. 24, 32. And this reference by means of a Genitive Suffix is, in certain cases, so fixed and binding, that it is not omitted even though a Demonstrative pron. should accompany the word, *e. g.* **ዘመኑ፡ ዝንቱ፡ መልክዑ፡ ወመጽሐፉ** *τίνος ἢ εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή;* Matt. 22, 20.

(¹) Just as happens so often in Sanskrit: in fact this is the origin of the Article in most languages.

(b) The use of the Suff. Pron. to compensate for the Article has spread from such cases, to cases in which a Genitive relation appears unthinkable to us. When a subject, to wit, is introduced into the discourse, and later on is mentioned again by the same name, it takes, in other languages, the Article upon its second appearance. In Ethiopic, however, a Suffix of the third Person is very often attached to it, upon its second appearance, by way of reference to the name as first used, *e. g.* **ሐለምኩ : ሕልሙ : ወከመዝ : ሕልሙ** “I dreamed a dream, and this is (‘its dream’) the dream” Gen. 37, 9; “they cast him into a pit (**ዐዘቅት :**) **ወዐዘቅታሰ :** ሐዳስ “but the pit was new” Gen. 37, 24; “I saw there a high throne (**መንበረ :**) **ወእመትሕተ : መንበሩ : ዐበይ** and from under the great throne (proceeded) &c.” Hen. 14, 18, 19; “ye stood by the base of the mountain (**ደብር :**) **ወይነድድ : ደብሩ** while the mountain burned” Deut. 4, 11; 9, 15. *Cf.* also Tob. 6, 5, 12; 7, 9; *Chrest.* p. 31, line 2; and notice particularly **ካልኩ** = ὁ ἄλλος. Cases in which the definite Article is indicated in this remarkable way are by no means rare, *cf. e. g.* farther Deut. 13, 16; Ex. 3, 2; Judges 1, 8; 6, 20 (**ሥጋሁ :**) 17, 2 (**ወርቁ :**) 17, 5 (**ብእሲሁ :**) 19, 16; Ruth 2, 17 (**ሰገሙ :**) Mark 2, 22 (**ወይኑ** and **ዝቁ :**) Hen. 26, 5 (**ወኩሉ : ቂላቱ**⁽¹⁾) “and all the (= those) valleys”, referring back to vs. 2—4; [*Kebra Nag.* 97 a 18 (**ዕለቱ :**) 97 b 10 (**ጊዜሁ : ወዕለቶ : ወሰዐቶ**)] &c. In all these cases the Suffix is to be explained in accordance with § 156: **ደብሩ** relative to **ደብር** is “mountain, it” *i. e.* “it, the mountain”, thus = **ወእቱ : ደብር**.

(c) A third method of replacing the Article, and in fact the most usual one, is the following:—When there appears in the sentence a determined word, subordinated to a Verb or to a Noun in the Constr. St. (with which last, the Prepositions coincide), a Suffix relating to this word is appended to the governing Verb or Noun, and the relation of this Suffix to the dependent word is indicated by prefixing **ለ** to the dependent word (§ 164, No. 2); *e. g.* **ወሰመዮ : እግዚአብሔር : ለብርሃን : ዕለተ** “and God called (‘it’, referring to ‘light’) the light, day” Gen. 1, 5; **ላዕሌሁ : ለባዕለ : ቤት** “against (‘him’,—referring to ‘master of the house’) the master of the house” Matt. 20, 11; (**ነፍሱ : ላዕለ : ገጹ : ለአዳም** “he breathed upon the face of Adam” *Le Livre des Mystères* 16, 3); **ቀዳሚሃ : ለጥበብ** “the begin-

(1) [FLEMMING reads here **ቂላት**. TR.] —

ning of wisdom": but also **ቦቱ : በነገር** "with it, with the word" = "with the word" G. Ad. 6, 17. Yet the same turn is occasionally found even with undetermined nouns, *e. g.* **ርእያ : ለአሐቲ : አመት** *Chrest.* p. 42, line 14; *cf.* also *ibid.* p. 40, lines 17, 19, and G. Ad. 146, 10.

This form of periphrasis for the definite Article is by far the most usual one; and although doubtless the anticipation of a determined Noun by means of a Suffix relating thereto was introduced merely for the purpose of signifying the definite and known character of the Noun⁽¹⁾, yet the idiom came into such favour and currency⁽²⁾ that it is employed even in cases where the definiteness of a noun is already sufficiently indicated by means of accompanying demonstratives, or attached suffixes, or in some other fashion. In this respect the usage is exactly the same as in those languages which are in possession of an Article, for they employ it even in cases where it is not absolutely necessary, as in *ὁ πατήρ μου*. Examples: **ጸሐፍ : ሎቱ : ለመልአክ : ቤተ : ክርስቲያን** "write to the leader ('angel') of the church" Rev. 2, 1; **ርኢናሁ : ለእግዚእን** "we have seen our Lord" John 20, 25; **ወከመዝ : ትገብራ : ለይእት : ታቦት** "and thus shalt thou make that ark" Gen. 6, 15; **ዴግኖቶ : ወእኒዞቶ : ለዝኩ : ጸላኢ** "to pursue and capture that enemy" *Annales Johannis I*, (GUIDI, 1903) 33, 2; **ምሕረቱ : ለእግዚአብሔር** "the mercy of God"; **ይጼልሎን : ሠናያተ** *ἀμαυροῖτα καλὰ* Sap. 4, 12; **ወምክርክ : መኩ : አእመሮ** Sap. 9, 17; **ልበ : ዚአሁ : ትፈቅዱ : ታእምሮዎ** Judith 8, 14. It is safe to say that this anticipation, by means of a relative Suffix, of a noun already determined by some other process, is more usually given than omitted. In a few cases **ለ** which generally serves to indicate the reference is left out, when the construction is self-evident, *e. g.* when the noun is governed in the Accusative: **ሀበኒያ : እንከሰ : ብእሲትየ** "give me now my wife" Gen. 29, 21; **ምድር : ትጐሥዖ : ሥጋሁ : ለአቤል** G. Ad. 89, 15; and in the Genitive connection: *Chrest.* p. 14, ll. 10, 18; p. 18, ll. 7 & 15.

If more than one determined word be dependent on one Verb or Noun (or Preposition), the Suffix may then be made to correspond with the first of these alone, as in **ወተዘከሮ : እግዚአብሔር : ለኖኅ : ወለኩሉ : አራዊት : ወለኩሉ : እንስሳ** &c. Gen. 8, 1;

(1) As appears from the fact that very rarely indeed are undetermined Nouns indicated in this way, that is, by means of an anticipatory suffix; *cf. supra*.

(2) Even more perhaps than in Aramaic.

9, 8; 12, 20; **ይባርከ ፡ ለኅሩይ ፡ ወለኅሩያን** “he praises the chosen one and the chosen people” Hen. 40, 5; **ዐሥራተ ፡ እዴሁ ፡ ለአዛብ ፡ ወለጸናታም ፡ ወለኩሉ ፡ አኅማላት** Luke 11, 42; and thus regularly, when the first dependent word is the most important of the series; or the Suffix is made to correspond with the whole body of them, as in **ረከቦሙ ፡ ለስምያን ፡ ወለእንድርያስ** “he found Simon and Andrew” Mark 1, 16; Gen. 14, 2; or, finally, the Suffix is made to correspond simply with the nearest Genitive or Accusative; and the plain Genitive- or Accusative-subordination is continued with the others, *e. g.* **ወነሥኣ ፡ ለሳራ ፡ ብእሲቱ ፡ ወሎጥሃ ፡ ወኩሎ ፡ ንዋዮሙ** Gen. 12, 5; 14, 16; 32, 8; **ልቡ ፡ ለፈርዖን ፡ ወዘዐበይቱ** “the heart of Pharaoh and of his great ones” Ex. 14, 5.

It is, however, by no means necessary that a Suffix of this kind, referring to a determined Noun, named in the sentence, should invariably precede the noun, and the noun invariably come second. On the contrary, when it is demanded by the sense and structure of the sentence, an Accusative or Genitive of this kind may also be placed before the word on which it depends, *e. g.* **ወለብእሲትኒ ፡ ይቤላ** “and unto the woman in turn he said” Gen. 3, 16 (*v. infra* § 196). Even when the Accusative or Genitive is placed after the Suffix, it does not need to follow it directly, but may be separated from it by several words. It is evident that by means of this circumlocutory substitute for the definite Article with Nouns standing in any sort of subordination, it has been made possible to attain also a greater freedom in Word-arrangement; and this consideration has contributed to the great predominance of such a periphrasis in the language.

2. Methods
of indica-
ting In-
definiteness
in the Noun.

§ 173. 2. As Ethiopic has thus means enough to signify specially the determination of a Noun when required, there was the less demand for a special indication of the undetermined Noun by means of the so-called Indefinite Article. The context, in fact, together with the absence of any note of determination, suffices to show that a word is undetermined: **መጽኡ ፡ መሰግላን** “there came Magi” Matt. 2, 1; **ዘይፈኢ ፡ ብእሲተ** “whosoever looketh on a woman” 5, 28 &c. If indefiniteness is not sufficiently shown thereby, it is generally a matter of indifference whether the word in question is regarded as determined or undetermined, as in Matt. 2, 12 **ወነገሮሙ ፡ በሕልም** “and he told them in a dream *or* in the dream”; and in 2, 13 **ናሁ ፡ መልእክ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ አስተርአዮ** “behold,

an angel *or* the angel of God appeared to him”; and in 19, 21 **ለምስኪን** “to the poor man *or* to a poor man”. But in those cases in which the indefinite article of other tongues expresses the notion of “any one”, and in the same way with the plural “any”, “some”, Ethiopic has, to be sure, a mode of its own of denoting this idea. When a human being is meant, “any one” is **ብእሲ** or **ሰብእ** *e. g.* Matt. 22, 16; [*Kebra Nag.* 141 a 19]; and fem. **ብእሲት**, *e. g.* **ብእሲት : ዕብራዊት** “a Hebrew woman”: and yet **አሐዱ**, **አሐቲ** “one (*m. & f.*)” is also used for it, and in fact not only in cases where *εἷς* stands even in the Greek original text, as in Matt. 8, 19; Gen. 22, 13, but also in other cases, *e. g.* Gen. 38, 2 *καὶ εἶδε θυγατέρα ἀνθρώπου Χαναναίου* **ወርአየ : አሐተ : ወለተ : አሐዱ : ብእሲ : ከናናዊ**; *Chrest.* p. 24, ll. 20, 21, 25; p. 25, l. 14; p. 31, l. 1 (**ወ-እቱ : ጅብእሲ**) &c. “One another” too is generally expressed by **አሐዱ** and **ካልኡ** with a preposition of some kind before the **ከ**. With names of things an express indication of indeterminateness is still less necessary; but **አሐዱ** may also be used in the case of things, *e. g.* Josh. 24, 32, or turns of speech like **ዕዳ : ዘኮነ** “any thing as a debt” Deut. 24, 10. In plural-notions, the mere plural often serves to express “some” or an undefined “several”, “many”, as in **እምድጎረ : መዋዕል** “some days *or* several days after” Judges 14, 8; 15, 1. Besides, Ethiopic possesses the following additional means, very frequently adopted, of expressing these notions: (a) the employment of the preposition **እምነ**, which denotes part of a whole (v. § 164, No. 3), *e. g.* **እምዕፀብ** “some difficulty” Matt. 19, 23; **እለ : እምወስተ : ጸሐፍት** “certain scribes” 9, 3; **ካልኡቱ : እምክርዳኢሁ** “two of his disciples” 21, 1; **እምነ : ትብሒልከ** “some of thy pottage” Gen. 25, 30 (for other examples v. § 164, 3):—(b) the periphrasis which consists of **ቦ**: “there is”, *or* “there are” (§ 167, 1, b) and the relative pronoun following, *e. g.* **እመቦ : ዘኅደገ** “whosoever putteth away” (*lit.*—“if there is who hath put away”) Matt. 19, 9; **ቦእለ : በጽሐ** “some came” Gen. 14, 3; **ቦእለ : ሀለዉ : እምእለ : ይቀውሙ : ዝየ** “there be some standing here” (*lit.* “there are who are of those who stand here”) Matt. 16, 28; hence **ቦዘ : —ቦዘ : —ቦዘ** (or **ቦእለ** &c.) “some—, others—others” &c. Matt. 21, 35; 22, 5; 25, 15:—(c) the negative for “not any one” or “no one”, “no man”, “nothing”,—either **አልቦ : ዘ** “there is not one, who”, or **ኢ** with **መኑሂ** following, or in the neuter **ምንትኒ** (§ 147, b):—“nothing at all” or “no one at all” is

also rendered by **ሁሉ** with a negation.—For any one who is spoken of indefinitely, but definitely thought of, his name being withheld, —in Greek *ὁ δεῖναι*, and in Hebrew *פְּלִנִּי אֶלְמִנִּי*,—Ethiopic has the expression **አገሌ** Matt. 26, 18, the formation and derivation of which are still quite obscure.

II. GOVERNMENT OF THE VERB.

1. NOUNS AND PRONOUNS IN SUBORDINATION TO THE VERB.

Accusative
of an
associated
Nomen
as deter-
mining the
idea of the
Verb. 1—
Accusative
of Deter-
mination.

§ 174. The Verb may govern Nouns in the Accusative, and this form of subordination is the most direct and usual one. When it falls short, recourse is had to prepositions to assist the Verb. There is no third mode by which a Verb can bring a Noun into combination with itself. Even the so-called Adverbs are almost invariably dependent on the Verb as Accusatives or as prepositional forms; and even the comparatively small number of Adverbs which (being of pronominal or other origin) are not formed by means of the Accusative, or by prepositions (§§ 160—163), must yet be thought of as subordinated to the Verb as *quasi*-Accusatives.

(a) *The Verbal Object expressed by the Accusative.*

The Accusative in Ethiopic has the most varied functions to fulfil, as has been already indicated (§ 143).

1. It serves to complete the idea of the Verb by means of *some definite limitation*.

(a) Adverbial
Accusative
of Kind and
Manner.

(a) A Noun (*Nomen*) of some sort, in the Accusative case, may in this way be associated with the verb, to signify the *kind and manner*,—as a general condition,—*of the action* (Adverbial Accusative).

Adjectives in the Accusative describe the kind and manner of the action, as in: **በከዩ ሙረረ** “he wept bitterly (‘a bitter weeping’)” Matt. 26, 75; **ዘአንበለ ፡ ይርሐቁ ፡ እምሀገር ፡ ነዋኅ** “before they had withdrawn far from the city” Gen. 44, 4; **ሠናዩ ፡ ተነበዩ ፡ ኢሳይያስ** “well hath Esaias prophesied” Matt. 15, 7. And in this way Adjectives may form Adverbs, by taking the Accusative § 163). In those cases, however, in which such limiting expression applies to the Subject or Object rather than to the Verb, as, *e. g.*

“he fled naked”, or “he took him alive”, it must be immediately referred, in Ethiopic, to the Subject or Object, and placed in apposition to it (v. § 189).

And so too may the idea of the Verb be supplemented by Substantives in the Accusative to describe the kind and manner of the Action, by way of special circumstances, although in that case prepositions are employed oftener perhaps than the Accusative: **ግብተ፡ ይነድፍዎሙ** “suddenly they shoot at them” Ps. 63, 4 (v. also § 163); **ነበረ፡ ዐውደ** “he sat (‘judgment’) on the judgment seat” Matt. 27, 19; **ይነብር፡ ጽመ፡ ውስተ፡ ምግላሠ፡ ጽርሐ፡ ቅስፈ** Judges 3, 24; **ቆሙ፡ ዲፓ** “they stood (in) ambush” Judges 9, 44; **ሐመ፡ ፈጸንተ** “he was sick of a fever” cf. Luke 4, 38; **ሞተ፡ ሠናየ፡ ርሥኦ** “he died in a good old age” Gen. 25, 8; **ርኢከዎ፡ ለኢግዚአብሔር፡ ገጸ፡ በገጽ** “I have seen God face to face” Gen. 32, 31; Judges 6, 22; **ሕገ፡ ዘየዐቢ** “by the law (‘right’) of the greater” *Chrest.* p. 97, l. 21 sq.; cf. p. 96, l. 16.

In the same way a Substantive-Infinitive may be subordinated to the verb to determine it more definitely: **አጥፍኦ፡ ያጠፍኦሙ** “*delendo delebit eos*” Josh. 17, 13; cf. § 181.

(b) *Determinations of Place and Time* are combined with the verb in the same way (Accusative of Place and Time), and that both in the case of Verbs of Motion and Verbs of Rest. This use of the Accusative is very common. Thus one says **ወፅኦ፡ ገዳመ** “he went out to the field”; **ወፅኦ፡ ፀብኦ** “he went out to war” Judges 3, 10; **አተዉ፡ ብሔሮሙ** “they returned to their own land” Matt. 2, 12; **ዐርገ፡ ሀገረ** “he went up to the city” Matt. 21, 18; **እቀድመከሙ፡ ገሊላ** “I shall go before you into Galilee” Matt. 26, 32; [**በጽሐ፡ ኢየሩሳሌም** *Revue sémit.* 1906, p. 277, l. 21]; **ቤተ፡ አቡኪ** “in thy father’s house” Gen. 24, 23; **ወወደየ፡ ትርኢሲሁ** “and he set (them) for his pillow” Gen. 28, 11; **ሢጥዎ፡ ብሔረ፡ ግብጽ** “they sold him into the land of Egypt” Gen. 37, 36; Hen. 14, 2; **ሀለወ፡ ገዳመ** “he was in the field” Gen. 4, 8; Matt. 24, 26; **ምሥራቀ** “eastward” (in answer to the question, ‘where?’) G. A. 30, 23; **ቆመ፡ ምድረ** βέβηκε ἐπὶ γῆς Sap. 18, 15 A; cf. also **ብሔረ፡ ሕያዋን** *Tab. Tab.* 12, 2 (*Chrest.* p. 110); **ምድረ፡ ርስቱ** *Tab. Tab.* 18, 1 (*Chrest.* p. 112). In all these cases prepositions, like **በ**, **ካበ**, **ውስተ** &c., might also have been employed; and frequently both modes of connection are made use of, side by side, in the same sentence, if several indications of place are mentioned: **የአቱ፡ ሀገሮ፡ ወው**

ስተ : ቤቱ “he goes home to his own city and to his own house” Josh. 20, 6; so too in Gen. 30, 25 and 31, 3; or **እትዉ : ውስተ : አብያቲክሙ : ወውስተ : ደወልክሙ : ብሔረ⁽¹⁾ : ዘወሀበክሙ : ሙሴ** Josh. 22, 4.

Of *Time*: **ማእከለ : ሌሊት** “at midnight” Matt 25, 6; **አሐተ : ሰዓተ** “for one hour” 26, 40; **ሌሊተ** “to-night” Gen. 19, 5; **ቀትረ** “at midday” 18, 1; **ዓመ** “in a year” 18, 10; **አሐተ : ዕለተ** “(on) one day” *Chrest.* p. 44, l. 16; **ጽናሕ : ንስቲተ** “wait a little” Hen. 52, 5; **ወሐይወ : አዳም : ፪፻ ወ፴ ዓመተ** Gen. 5, 3⁽²⁾; and in Relative clauses: **በዕለት : እንተ : ትበልዑ** “on the day on which ye shall eat” Gen. 2, 17. Prepositions may be used for this relation also.

(c) Accusa-
tive of
Measure.

(c) In like manner determinations of *Measure* are expressed in the Accusative: **ተለዐለ : ዐሠርተ : ወኅምስተ : እመተ** “it rose fifteen cubits” Gen. 7, 20; **ወእመ : ውሕዱ : እልክቱ : ጸድቃን : ኅምስተ** “and if those righteous men are five fewer” Gen. 18, 28; **የሐጽጽ : ፶ መዋዕለ** “he is too short (‘too late’) by fifty days” Hen. 74, 14; **ክፍልዋ : ለምድር : ሰብዐተ : ክፍለ** “divide ye the land into seven parts” Josh. 18, 6; Hen. 77, 3; Gen. 32, 8; **ዐብየ : ክፍሉ : ምኅምስተ : ዘእልክቱ** “his portion was five times as great as theirs” Gen. 43, 34; **ከመ : ፕጸ : እሙንቱ : ብዝኖሙ** “they were as the sand in their multitude” Judges 7, 12; **እመ : ብክሙ : ሃይማኖተ : መጠነ : ኅጠተ : ስናፕ** “if ye have faith as great as a grain of mustard seed” Matt. 17, 20. **አከለ** “it amounts to”, in particular is always associated in this way with the Accusative of the measure: **የአክሉ : እልፈ : ወኅምስተ : ምእተ** “there were about 10,500” Judges 8, 10; 9, 49.

2. Accusa-
tive of
Purport or
Reference:
(a) Empha-
tic Acc. of

§ 175. 2. A Verb may also be completed by means of an Accusative which gives *its purport or its reference*, in both of which cases the governed Noun is coupled still more closely with the verbal idea ⁽³⁾.

Derived
Noun, or
Noun of
Kindred
Meaning.

(a) Thus a Verb may govern a *Substantive derived from itself*, in order to explain itself by itself, as in **ተምዕዐ : መዐተ** “he was angry” (*lit.* “he was angry with anger”) Judges 2, 14; 9, 30;

⁽¹⁾ Where, to be sure, the Accusative may also be explained by Attraction (§ 201).

⁽²⁾ [The Ethiopic, as usual, follows the Septuagint here, *διακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη*, instead of the Hebrew *הַשָּׁנָה תְּשִׁבָּה יָמִים*. TR.]

⁽³⁾ Cases like **ይልሕሞ : እከየ** “is weaker than it in malice” are rare (v. DILLMANN'S ‘*Lex.*’, col. 30).

መሐላ፡ንምሐል “let us swear an oath” Hen. 6, 4; **ሐለምነ፡ሕልመ** “we have dreamed a dream” Gen. 40, 8; or to give thereby a special emphasis to the idea which belongs to the Verb (a purpose which at other times is served by the Infinitive instead of by a noun, v. § 181, δ): **ጸግ፡ጸመውን** “we are wearied out” Hen. 103, 9; **ብዕልነ፡ብዕለ** “we have become rich” Hen. 97, 8; Gen. 2, 17; **ቡ፡ባእሰ፡ተባእሰ፡ምስለ፡እስራኤል** “did he fight at all with Israel?” (contrasted with keeping the peace) Judges 11, 25; but chiefly to attach to the Accusative a farther determining factor, *e. g.* an Adjective, by which combination of Substantive and Adjective an Adverbial conception is indicated: **ተምዕዕ፡መዐተ፡ዐቢዩ** “he was angered exceedingly” Gen. 39, 19; **ተፈሥሐ፡ፍሥሐ፡ዐቢዩ** “he rejoiced with great joy” Matt. 2, 10; **ፈርሁ፡ዐቢዩ፡ፍርሁተ** “they feared exceedingly” Mark 4, 41; **ወሣቀዮ፡ዐቢዩ፡ሥቃዩ፡ወእኩዩ** “and he plagued him with a great and evil plague” Gen. 12, 17; Josh. 10, 10, 20; Gen. 46, 29; 27, 33; Hen. 12, 4; 65, 5; or **ተሐሞ፡ለርእስከ፡ተሐምዎ፡ዘቢአዩ** “perform thou for thyself the kinsman’s duty which belongs to me” Ruth 4, 6. Thus too in Relative Clauses: **በእንተ፡በረከቱ፡ዘባረኮ፡አቡሁ** “because of his blessing wherewith his father had blessed him” Gen. 27, 41; **በኩነኔ፡ዘኩነንክሙ** “with the judgment with which ye judge” Matt. 7, 2. Occasionally also Nouns from other roots, but of kindred meaning, are subordinated in this way: **ሰባሕኩ፡. . . ስሞ፡ለእግዚእ፡. . . በረከተ፡ወስብሐተ** Hen. 39, 9; **ቃለ፡ጽራኃቲሆሙ፡ዕራቃ፡ጸርኅተ፡ምድር** Hen. 9, 2. In such cases the preposition **በ** is frequently used instead of the Accusative: **ይትፈሥሐ፡በፍሥሐ** Hen. 25, 6; **ወወውዑ፡በዐቢይ፡ውውዓ፡ወጽኑዕ** Josh. 6, 20.

(b) In particular, verbs which express *Fulness and Abundance* or *their opposites* attract in the Accusative the object with which a person or thing is full or empty (although such object may also be introduced by **እምነ**, in accordance with § 164, No. 3): **ይትመልኡ፡ጥበበ** “they grew full of wisdom” Hen. 48, 1; Ps. 64, 14 (with **እምነ** Hen. 56, 4; Matt. 22, 10); **ዓዕፈ፡ጸግቡ** “they are full of new wine” Acts 2, 13 (with **እም** Hen. 63, 10); **ኅጣእኩ፡ፈውሰ** “I was in want of healing” Ps. 37, 7. Thus we say **ምድር፡እንተ፡ትውሕዝ፡ሐሊበ፡ወመዓረ** “a land, which flows with milk and honey” Ex. 33, 3; Josh. 5, 6; **ኩለንታሃ፡ትተከል፡ዕፀወ** “it is all planted with trees” Hen. 10, 18.

(b) Acc. of Related Noun with Verbs of Plenty and Want &c.

So also, Verbs of *Clothing oneself* (ተለብሰ, ተዐጸፈ &c.) and of *Overlaying* or *Covering*, e. g. ትቀፍሎ፡ ወርቀ “thou shalt overlay it with gold” Ex. 25, 11, 28; ትቀብክ፡ ፒሳ “thou shalt smear it with pitch” Gen. 6, 14 &c. Cf. also ከሐሎ፡ ሐዋተ Tobit 11, 10.

(c) Accusa-
tive of
Relation or
Limitation.

(c) The Accusative assigns to the Verb *the relation which the Verb has to some object*; or else it restricts to some limited part of the object, the relation of the Verb which is already given in a general way in the Subject-Case or Object-Case. In Passive and Semi-passive Verbs, the Subject which is referred to in the action, is given in the Subject-Case (or Nominative); but if,—properly speaking,—it is not the whole Subject, but only a part of it, that is affected by such action, then this part is attached in the form of an explanatory Accusative: ልያ፡ ትደዊ፡ አዕይንቲሃ “Leah was tender-eyed (*lit.*—‘suffered in her eyes’)” Gen. 29, 17; ተመይጡ፡ ገጸሙ “they turned their faces” (‘they turned about as to their faces’) Judges 18, 23; ተገልበበት፡ ገጸ “she veiled her face” (*lit.* ‘she veiled herself as to her face’) Gen. 38, 15; 24, 65; ትትከደን፡ ዕርቃክ “(that) thou mayest cover thy nakedness” (*lit.* ‘cover thyself as to thy nakedness’) Rev. 3, 18; ተጎፀብ፡ ገጸክ “wash thy face” (‘thyself as regards thy face’) Matt. 6, 17; 27, 24; Mark 7, 3; Gen. 43, 31; ወተሀውክ፡ ዮሴፍ፡ አጣፀዋቲሁ “and Joseph was perturbed in his emotions (‘bowels’)” Gen. 43, 30; v. also 4 Esr. 9, 39 (Laur. 40). With Active Verbs, the subject to which the action of the verb relates is given in the Object-Case, but the reference may farther be restricted to a portion of the Subject, by means of a second Accusative, and thus be indicated more accurately. This combination is very common in Ethiopic, and contributes a peculiarly delicate turn to the language: ገሰሳ፡ እዴሃ “he touched her hand”; አጎዛ፡ እዴሃ “he took her by the hand” Matt. 8, 15; 9, 29; 20, 34⁽¹⁾; ይከርዕዎ፡ ርእሶ “they smite him on the head” Matt. 27, 30; አዕወርዎሙ፡ አዕይንቲሆሙ “they blinded their eyes” (‘them in their eyes’) Gen. 19, 11; ሐቀፎ፡ ከሳዶ “he took him round the neck” (‘embraced him round his neck’) Gen. 33, 4; ሐቀፈቶ፡ ከሳዶ Tobit 11, 8; አጽንዎሙ፡ ልቦሙ “he hardened their heart” (‘them in their heart’) Josh. 11, 20; ቀረፀቶ፡ ፯ቄናዝዐ፡ ርእሱ “she shore off from him the seven locks of his head” (‘shore him as to the seven &c.’) Judges 16, 19. And even where other languages in

(1) [V., however, *Chrest.* 26, l. 9,—ወአጎዛ፡ በእዴሁ.]

such positions have only one Object-case, as in *ἥψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς* “he touched her hand”, the Ethiopian invariably employs two Accusatives.

§ 176. 3. Finally, the Accusative introduces the Person or Thing affected by the action, *i. e.* the material dealt with, or the *Object*. This is the ordinary use of the Accusative, such as is found also in other languages. Not only may all transitive verbs assume such an Accusative, but also many which originally are semi-passive may do so, by their passing into transitives through a new turn of the conception; just as **ገብረ** “to be active”, for example, is quite usually employed for “to make”, “to do”, without on that account surrendering its intransitive form (§ 76). In particular, the following verbs take the Accusative, contrary, in some instances, to the usage in our languages.

3. Accusative of the Object Proper, with Verbs of various meaning (*a—h*).

(a) *Verbs of Saying, Speaking, Narrating, Calling, Commanding &c.* Not only is that which one says rendered in the Accusative; but the person also to whom he speaks (whom he addresses) is introduced in the Accusative just as well as in the Dative (with **ለ**): **ይቤሉ** “he said to him”; **ይቤሉኝ** “they said to me”; and so with the verbs **ተናገረ** in Matt. 28, 18; Mark 14, 11, *et saepe*; **ነበበ** in Matt. 25, 36, 39; and **አበዩ** “to refuse (something) to one”, taking the Accusative of the Person, Matt. 18, 30, &c. Particularly if the person is expressed merely by a pronoun (Suffix), this Accusative connection is made use of; otherwise **ለ** is more frequently employed. The verb **መሐለ** with the Accusative may mean “to swear by (something)” — “to invoke anything by way of oath”, Matt. 5, 34, 35; 23, 18, 22; but yet **በ** may also be used in this case, Matt. 23, 16, 18.

(b) *Verbs of Equality, Resemblance &c., e. g.* **ይመስል** : **ብእሴ** Matt. 7, 24; 13, 24, 31; but yet such verbs also may be connected with **ምስል**, **ከመ**, **በ** or **ለ**.

(c) For Verbs of *Fulness and Want*, v. *supra*.

(d) *Verbs of Ability and Weakness, and of Slightness*, in so far as by a new turn of the idea they assume the sense of Overpowering and Surpassing, or the reverse. Thus **ክህለ** with the Accusative means “to be able for one”, *i. e.* “to master him” Gen. 32, 26; **ጸንዐ** with the Accusative, “to be too strong for one”, “to overcome him” Josh. 17, 13; Mark 1, 7; **ኅዩለ** “to be strong”, with Acc. “to vanquish” Matt. 16, 18; Luke 11, 22; Ps. 17, 20: in the same

way **ተከህለ** “to gain power over any one” Matt. 24, 24; **ተጎደለ** Ps. 37, 12; Gen. 19, 9. This union also is adopted the most readily, when the Accusative is a Personal Pronoun (Suffix). A peculiar delicacy and brevity in the Ethiopic speech, in stating comparisons, depends upon this Accusative-use, inasmuch as in every comparison, the person or thing, with which comparison is made, may when expressed by a Pronoun be attached, as an Accusative Suffix, to any Intransitive or Passive verb,—although on the other hand **እምነ** must be employed, when it is expressed by a Noun: **አብ : የዐብየኒ** “the Father is greater than I” (‘surpasses me in greatness’) John 14, 28; **የዐብየ** Gen. 48, 19; **እለ : የአክይዎ** “who are more wicked than he” Luke 11, 26; **ዘይልሀቀኸሙ** “who is greater than you” Matt. 23, 11; **ይስአኒኸሙ** “is impossible for you” Matt. 17, 20; Gen. 18, 14; **እንተ : ትሔንያ** “who is fairer than she”, Judges 15, 2; **ይጽብበኸሙ** “is too narrow for you” Josh. 17, 15; **ዘይንእሶ** “who is younger than he” Gen. 25, 23; Judges 15, 2; **ጸናዕኒ : ጥቀ** “thou hast become much too powerful for us” Gen. 26, 16; **አልቦ : ብእሴ : ዘይጠብበከ** “there is no man who is wiser than thou” Gen. 41, 39; **አልቦ : ዘእፈደፍደክ** “in nothing shall I be greater than thou” Gen. 41, 40; **ወይቴሐቶ : ሎቱ** “and it is lower than the same” Hen. 26, 4 (*cf. infra*, § 187, 3).

(e) Verbs of *Coming, Going, Arriving at*, are connected with an Accusative, not only in the sense given above, § 174, 1, b, but also with a true Object-Accusative: **ሐረ : ፍኖቶ** “he went his way” Gen. 19, 2; **አንሶሰወ** with the Accusative of the land = “to go through it” Judges 18, 9; **የደ** with Accusative “to pass through (a land)” Gen. 12, 6; **ዐደወ : ፈለገ** “to cross the river” Gen. 31, 21; **ጎለፈ** with Accusative “to step aside from anything” “to pass from” Hen. 41, 5; and thus too with Personal Objects, *e. g.* **በጽሐ** and **መጽኦ** with Accusative “to surprise one”, “to overtake him” Matt. 23, 36; Gen. 14, 15; 15, 12; Judges 16, 9; **ሐረ** with the Accusative of the female “to lie with”, “to cover” Ex. 22, 19; Mark 7, 21; **ተራከበ** “to meet with any one” Matt. 28, 9 &c. In the same way, Verbs of *Following, Pursuing, Getting before*, *e. g.* **ቀደመ** with Accusative “to get before any one” Matt. 21, 31; Mark 6, 45; Judges 7, 24 (F).

(f) The following Verbs also take an Accusative:—Verbs of *Recollecting and Keeping in mind*, *e. g.* **ዘከረ** “to call any one to mind” Matt. 26, 13; of *Pleasing and Being agreeable to*, inasmuch

as the idea of ‘satisfying’ is at the root of them, as **አደመ** (always with the Accusative); **ሐወዘ** Matt. 21, 15; and of *Delighting in* (*Choosing*), like **ሠምረ** Mark 1, 11.

(g) All those Verbs, which may be referred to the idea of “*dealing with one*”, of “*doing something to one*”, may govern in the Accusative the object affected by them, *e. g.* **ሠሐቀ** with Accusative, “to laugh one to scorn” Mark 5, 40; **ኅፈረ** with Acc. “to be ashamed of one” Mark 8, 38 (or “to be bashful *or* timid in presence of one”, ‘to fear him’ Matt. 21, 37); **ከሕደ** with Accusative “to disown *or* deny any one”; **ዐለወ** “to be offended at any one” Matt. 26, 31, 33; **ረሰዩ** with the Accusative of the person “to do anything to one”, “to deal with him” Matt. 21, 36; **አምነ** “to believe *or* trust any one” Gen. 45, 26: whence, in particular, many Verbs of Stems I, 3 and III, 3, *e. g.* **ላሐወ** “to mourn for any one” Gen. 37, 34; **ተቃተለ** “to fight with one” Judges 1, 5; **ተጋደለ** with the same meaning; **ተቃወመ** and **ተናሥከ** “to rise against one” Ps. 147, 6; **ተዋቀሰ** “to dispute with one” Hen. 1, 9⁽¹⁾; even **ተምዕዐ** “to be angry with any one” Gen. 30, 2; **ተአመነ** “to trust any one” Rom. 15, 14 &c.

(h) Finally there belong to this class the forms already mentioned (§ 167, 1, *b*), and still farther to be discussed in a subsequent section (v. § 192, *b*), viz.:—**ብዩ**, **ብከ**, **ቦ** &c., by which the idea “to have” is indicated,—together with their negatives **አልብዩ** &c. Whenever these words express the idea “to have”, they are joined with the Accusative of the object (while, in the sense “there is” or “there exists”, they are completed by a Nominative). The only explanation that can be given of the association of the Accusative with these forms also,—is that the derived meaning gradually preponderated over the original one. Thus: **አልብከ** : **ክፍለ** “thou hast no part” Josh. 22, 25; **አቦ** : **ብነ** : **አብርሃም** “we have Abraham for father” Matt. 3, 9; **አስመ** : **ቦ** : **ብዙኅ** : **ጥሪተ** “for he had great possessions” Matt. 19, 22; **ባቲ** : **ወስተ** : **አፋሃ** : **ቂጽለ** “she had a leaf in her bill” Gen. 8, 11; **ጋኔነ** : **አልብዩ** “I have not a devil” John 8, 49. This very favourite idiom may be employed even when the possessing Subject is not only indicated by a substituted pronoun, but also by a Noun (Appellative or

(¹) [In this passage FLEMMING reads **ወይዘላፍ** instead of DILLMANN’s **ወይትዋቀሰ**. TR.]

Proper):—In the latter case **በ** receives the Suffix referring to the Noun, and the Noun itself is added, with **ለ** (as in § 172, c):—**ወባቲ : ለርብቃ : እኅወ** “and she,—Rebecca—, had a brother” Gen. 24, 29; or **ለ** may even be left out (as in § 172, c):—**ወቦሙ : ደቂቀ : ሮቤል : እንስሳ : ብዙኅ** “and the children of Reuben had many cattle” Numb. 32, 1; **ወቦቱ : ላባ : ክልኤ : አዋልደ** “and Laban had two daughters” Gen. 29, 16: or the Noun may stand as *absoluter Vorhalt* (in accordance with § 196):—**ብእሲ : ቦቱ : ክልኤተ : ውሉደ** “a (certain) man had two sons” Matt. 21, 28; and this is specially in place, when the Noun is indefinite, as in the case given here. However it frequently happens that in those cases in which **በ** and **አል** imply the notion of “*having*”, the Manuscripts nevertheless give the Nominative instead of the more usual Accusative, as in **ኀይል : አልብዩ** “I have no strength” (‘strength is not in me’) Ps. 68, 2; **አፍ : ቦሙ** “they have a mouth” Ps. 113, 13 *sqq.* (Note); **ዘቦሙ : ጥበብ** “who have wisdom” Hen. 5, 8⁽¹⁾; **አልቦ : ጥንተ : መዋዕሉ** “his days have no beginning” *Chrest.* p. 92, line 22 (on the other hand in line 26 we have **ጥንተ**); **አልቦ : አብ : ክርስቶስ** *ibid.* p. 93, line 2 &c. Such deviations may be explained by the supposition that **በ** is used in this combination, rather in accordance with its original sense than with its derived signification.

4. Double
Accusative
(a—g).Triple
Accusative.

§ 177. 4. In the wide-spread use of the Accusative, explained in §§ 174—176, we naturally find that many Verbs may be associated with a *double Accusative*. A transitive Verb for instance may take, besides its nearest Object-Accusative according to § 174 *sqq.*, a farther Accusative, of an adverbial or locative nature, as is proved by the examples which are adduced in these sections. Such instances need not be farther discussed at this stage. But there are, besides, many Verbs which govern a double Object-Accusative. Of this sort are (a) all Causatives of transitive Verbs, §§ 77, 79 *sqq.*; (b) in accordance with § 176 c, Verbs of Filling, Satisfying, Depriving; (c) following § 175, b,—Verbs of Clothing, Covering, Girding, Crowning, Surrounding, Overlaying, Removing, *e. g.* **ከደኑ** Hen. 54, 5; **ሰለበ** Matt. 27, 31; Gen. 37, 23; (d) Verbs of Giving, Entrusting, Bestowing, Taking, Robbing, in so far as the ideas which they convey are of the same order with (b) and (c), *e. g.* **ወሀበ** Matt. 20, 8; 21, 23; Gen. 30, 18; **አወፈዩ** Gen. 39, 4; **ሄደ**

(¹) [FLEMMING reads here, however, **ጥበበ**, the *Accusative*. TR.]

Luke 9, 39; 19, 26; **ነሥኦ** Gen. 14, 16 (30, 15); **ሰረቀ** Gen. 44, 6; **መጠወ** *Chrest.* p. 96, line 11; (e) in accordance with § 176, *g*, Verbs of Hindering, Forbidding, Refusing, *e. g.* **ከልኦ** Prov. 30, 7; **አባዩ** Gen. 24, 41; and of Requiring, and Doing or Dealing with, *e. g.* **ፈደዩ** Ps. 7, 4; **ረሰዩ** Matt. 21, 40; 27, 22; (f) in accordance with § 176, *b*, those of Comparing, and with § 176, *a*, those of Naming⁽¹⁾, Asking, Begging, Teaching, Relating, Addressing, *e. g.* **ተሰኝለ** Matt. 21, 24; Mark 4, 10; **ሰመዩ** Gen. 1, 5, 8 and frequently, &c. (*g*) Lastly, many Verbs, which express a Making or a Judging, may take, besides their nearest Object, another also as a Predicative-Accusative, that is,—such an Accusative as would form the predicate to the nearest Object, if that Object were set in an independent sentence as Subject. For example, **አምሰላ : ዘማ** “he considered her a whore”, *i. e.* “he thought that she was a whore” Gen. 38, 15; **ኪያክሙ : ኦለ : ዘእንበለ : ሐዘን : ንሬስዩክሙ** “we shall make you free from concern” Matt. 28, 14; **እገብሮ : ሕዝበ : መዲያ** “I shall make him a great nation” Gen. 17, 20; **እገብሮሙ : መብልዐ** “I shall make them into a dish” Gen. 27, 9; **እስርዎሙ : ከላስስተ** “bind ye them into sheaves” Matt. 13, 30; **ንግበራ : ለዛቲ : ምክር : ግብረ** “we will put this plan into execution” Hen. 6, 4; and thus frequently **ግብረ** with the Acc. of the material (*v.* DILLMAMN’S ‘*Lex.*’ col. 1160); also **ንነሥኦ : አዋልዱክሙ : ለነ : አንስቲያ** “we will take your daughters to us for wives” Gen. 34, 16. Still, in the cases last-named, the second Object, which here gives rather the product or result, may also be introduced by **ለ** (§ 179)⁽²⁾. And indeed with many of the verbs which have been mentioned, the association of a double Accusative is unnecessary, as one of the two Objects may be introduced also by a preposition (*cf. infra*). Farther, it may be observed, that when a verb takes two Objects, one of them is generally ‘determined’, and it is accordingly subordinated, by means of Suffixes and **ለ** (§ 172, *c*), provided it is not a mere Pronoun.

(1) Yet we find here and there, in a less careful style, in Verbs of Naming, expressions also like **ደጼውዕዎ : ለነፋስ : ቀዳማዊ : ጽባሓዊ** Hen. 77, 1; Gen. 26, 21,—where the Name remains as a Proper Noun in its first form. [In Hen. 77, 1, however, FLEMMING now reads **ለጽባሓዊ**. TR.]

(2) Of a different description are cases like the following: **ያመውኦክክ : ለጸላእትከ** “he gives to thine enemies the victory over thee” *Chrest.* p. 44, line 1; **ያሰትዩ : ለአሕዳሃ : ሕምዝ** *ibid.* p. 42, line 15; *cf. infra* p. 445.

A *Triple Accusative* is also met with,—that is to say, the Double-Accusative just described and an additional Accusative in the sense of a Dative,—*e. g.* in **ዘኣርባሕነ : ዡሎ : ፍጥረተ : ዘዘ ዚኣሁ : ፍሬ** *qui fecisti, ut singulae creaturae nobis fructus varios afferant* II Const. Ap. 39.

5. Accusa-
tive after
Reflexive
Verbs, and
after the
Passives of
Verbs
which
govern two
Accusa-
tives.

5. That even Reflexive Verbs (St. III) govern an Accusative, has already been indicated by several examples in § 80⁽¹⁾; and,—inasmuch as it makes no difference in the subordination of an Object, whether a Verb is used semi-passively and reflexively in St. I, 1 or in St. III (like **መልክ** and **ተመልክ** “to be full” and “to fill oneself”, both being joined with an Accusative, or **ለብሰ** and **ተለብሰ** “to put on” and “to clothe oneself”),—this case does not differ essentially from those which have been described in §§ 175, 176. In the very same way a verb, which takes again a simple meaning in the Reflexive Stem, in many cases no longer differs at all, as regards association with an Accusative, from a simple Transitive, as in the case of **መጠወ** “to hand over”, **ተመጠወ** “to cause to be handed over to oneself”, *i. e.* “to receive”, “to take”; **ተልእከ** “to let oneself be sent”, *i. e.* “to serve”, with the Accusative of the Person, Matt. 25, 44; 27, 55; **ተፀምዶ** “to bind oneself to”, *i. e.* “to be attached to”, “to be a follower of”, with an Accusative, Matt. 27, 57; **ተቀበለ** “to go to meet” Gen. 14, 17; **ተኣመነ** “to confess” Mark 1, 5; **ተጽዕነ** “to ride”, with Accusative, Gen. 49, 17. In fact Reflexive Stems, which have again become Simple in their meaning, may take two Accusatives, *e. g.* **ተስኧለ** (v. *supra*, under No. 4).

In like manner all Passives of Verbs which have two Accusatives in the Active, take the Accusative of one of the two Objects of the Active Stem, *e. g.* **ተምህረ** “to be taught” (“to learn”) with Accusative of the Object, Luke 1, 4; **ተፈድዩ** “to receive something in compensation” with Accusative of the thing, Deut. 15, 2, 3; Ps. 39, 21; **ተዐስዩ** with Accusative “to be recompensed for something” Mark 10, 30; **ዡሎ : ተውሀበኒ** “all things have been given to me” Matt. 11, 27; **ተከፍለ** with Acc., “to receive something allotted”. —For other examples v. Ex. 36, 6; Deut. 11, 11 [and CORNILL, *Weise*

(¹) Cf. also, *e. g.* Judith 10, 3 *sq.*: **ተጎዕበት : ሥጋሃ : በማይ : ወተቀብአት : ዕፍረተ : ሥዕርተ : ርእሳ : ወተነፍቀት : ሥዕርታ : . . . ወተሰርገወት : አውቃፋተ.**

Philos., p. 51]. It is especially binding, in the case of all verbs, which in the Active along with the nearest Object take a Predicate-, or Product-Accusative,—that this Predicate or Product appear also with the Passive, as an Accusative⁽¹⁾. Thus we have such an Accusative with all verbs which express the idea of “being called anything” or “found, thought, or declared to be anything”, or of “being made, chosen, appointed, or designated anything”, *e. g.* ተሰምዮ : ጎጹጸ “he is called⁽²⁾ the least” Matt. 5, 19; 23, 10; ድልወ : ዘተረከበ “who was found worthy”; ይትገደግ : ለከሙ : ቤትከሙ : በድወ “your house is left unto you desolate” Matt. 23, 38; ተጎለፋ : ሎቱ : ጽድቀ “it was reckoned to him for righteousness” Gen. 15, 6; መድኅን : ተተርጎመ “it is interpreted (as) Redeemer”; ሀብተ : ተወሀቡ : ለእግዚአብሔር “they are given to God (‘as a’) for a gift” Numb. 18, 6; ተሠየምኩ : ላእክ “I was appointed a minister” Eph. 3, 7. Only rarely is the Nominative employed in these cases, in place of the Predicate-Accusative, and then in such a way that the Predicate is associated with the Subject as an Apposition: ተሠይመ : እልዓዛር : ወልዱ : ከህን : ህየንቲህ “his son Eleazar was ordained (as) Priest in his stead” Deut. 10, 6.

The employment of the Accusative with these Passives explains also the peculiarity, found both in Ethiopic and Arabic⁽³⁾, according to which the Verbs of ‘*Being, Becoming and Remaining*’ ሀለወ, ኮነ, ነበረ (ቆመ) take the Predicate in the Accusative, in respect that the idea of “having been made something” or “being made something” is always present in these verbs,—for instance: እከውን : ገጹሐ “I shall be pure” Ps. 17, 26; ዘኮነ : ወይነ “that was made wine” John 2, 9; ኮነ : ነዳፌ “he became an archer” Gen. 21, 20; ዘሀለወ : ድልወ “who is ready” 1 Peter 4, 5; ምንተ : ኮንኪ (“what hast thou become?”) “what aileth thee?” Gen. 21, 17; ኩኒ : አእላፈ “become thousands” Gen. 24, 60; ይነብር : ክበቡ : በከ “its circle remains empty” Hen. 78, 14; ጉቡአነ : ይነብሩ “they sat assembled together” Hen. 13, 9; ከመ : ይንበሩ : ጻድቃነ : ወንጹላነ “that they remain just and pure” Hen. 69, 11; ይቀውሙ : ዕሩዓነ “they stand idle” Matt. 20, 3: In the same way also, ወፅኦ, *e. g.* ይወፅኦ : እኩዮ ἀποβαίνει σκληρός Sir. 30, 8. Connected with this

Accusative
after Verbs
of Being,
Becoming
&c.

(1) Just as in Arabic, EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 546.

(2) In verbs of “being called”, proper names for the most part are not put in the Accusative, *e. g.* Gen. 17, 5; 11, 9.

(3) EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 553 *sqq.*

also is the use of **ኮነ** with the Accusative, meaning “to serve as something”, *e. g.* **ወትከውን : ተአምረ** “and it shall be for a token” Gen. 9, 13; **ወከኖሙ : ግንፋሎሙ : እብነ** “and their bricks served as stone to them” Gen. 11, 3. This is the established rule which is followed in the case of **ኮነ**, **ሀለወ**, **ነበረ**; but in cases where the Predicate may also be regarded as an Apposition, owing to the verbal idea being less vacant than in **ኮነ** or **ሀለወ**, (*e. g.* in “why stand ye idle?”) another form of connection is also possible (§ 189). If indeed a Nominative is often found with **ኮነ** and **ሀለወ**⁽¹⁾, when we might have looked rather for an Accusative according to what has been said, then the cause is—either a mere piece of carelessness on the part of a copyist, or a different conception of the sentence: *e. g.* “it was *or* there was light” may be expressed by—“light arose”, and then the Ethiopic would be **ኮነ : ብርሃን**; or *light* may be regarded as a predicate to the impersonal form “it was *or* became”, and the Ethiopic would then be **ኮነ : ብርሃነ**; hence variation in Manuscripts, Gen. 1, 3; II. Hen. 89, 8. Thus we can say: **ኢኮነ : ወናየ** “it is not good” Matt. 15, 26, and **ኢኮነ : ወናይ** “it is not a good thing” Gen. 2, 18; **ወኮነ : ሕግ : ውስተ : እስራኤል** “a custom arose in Israel” Judges 11, 39,—where **ሕግ** might quite as well have appeared, “it became a custom”; **ሀለወ : ድፋን** (instead of **ድፋነ**) “it had been hidden in the ground” Josh. 7, 21, 22; **ዳኅንኑ : ሀሎከ** *Chrest.* p. 29, line 13.

6. Suffix
Pronoun
used as a
Secondary
Accusative
or a Dative
of Special
Reference.

§ 178. 6. A distinction must be made between all the cases which have been hitherto mentioned, and those in which a *Suff. Pron.* in Ethiopic is attached, *in the sense of a Dative* to Active, Intransitive, Reflexive, or Passive Verbs (§ 151). Such an Accusative expresses, not the nearest object, but the idea of “in relation to”, or “for”, and thus indicates the same thing which otherwise is expressed by **ለ**. It has most resemblance to the Accusative in the cases mentioned in § 175, *c*, but it is again distinguished from these by the circumstance that it is only allowable for the Suffix Pronoun. Thus we say **አርኅወነ** “open unto us” Matt. 25, 11; **ወይ ዩስከዎ** “and they shall add to him” Matt. 25, 29; **ተርፈኒ** “remains for me” Matt. 19, 20; **ዘይረትዐከ** “what is right to thee” (“what is

(1) That the Predicate cannot stand in the Accusative, when it is introduced by the preposition **ከመ** follows of course from § 165, No. 6; *e. g.* **ኢትኩኑ : ከመ : መድልዋን** Matt. 6, 5.

thine opinion”) Matt. 22, 17; **ይኔይሰከ** “it is better for thee” Matt. 5, 29, 30; **ኢትከውነከሙ ሰላም** “peace shall not be unto you” Hen. 5, 4; cf. also **ሀለወኒ** “it impends over me” in the periphrasis for the *Futurum instans* (§ 89), and **ምንትከ** (§ 198). Now since this employment of the Suff. Pron. with a Dative sense is in general possible, the periphrasis for the definite Article by means of a Suffix appended to the Verb (§ 172, c) may be extended to Nouns which stand in a Dative subordination to the Verb:—**ከኖ ለኖኅ** “there was to Noah” Gen. 7, 6; **ወይከውነከ ሙብልዐ ለከ ወሎሙ** “and it shall be for food for thee and for them” Gen. 6, 21 &c. This use of the suffix is most frequent with **ከኒ**, to express the notion of “being something to one”, or “serving as something to one”⁽¹⁾, and the Suffix is but seldom omitted in that case: “that she may become his wife” is always given in Ethiopic as **ትኩኖ ሰእሲቱ** or **ትኩኖ ሰእሲቶ**, not **ትኩን ሰእሲቶ**; so too **ይኩንከ ሙ ላእከ** “let him be your minister” Matt. 20, 26; **እሮ እንከ ይከውኖ ወልዶ** “how then can he be (at the same time) his son?” Matt. 22, 45. In virtue then of a peculiar subtlety in the Ethiopic language, every verb which has for Subject or Object some part of a living being (such as a member of the body, the soul, name, honour, qualities &c.) has a Suff. Pron. appended to it, referring to the Being itself and having a Dative or Accusative force,—for the purpose of signifying that the action proceeds from, or passes over to—not merely the part in question but also the Being itself, e. g. **ይትፌሥሐኒ ልብዩ** “my heart rejoices (in me)” Ps. 12, 6; Judges 19, 6; **ገብአ ልቡ** “his mind came back (to him)” Mark 5, 15; Luke 8, 35; **ደንገምሙ ልቦሙ** “their heart was perturbed (within them)” Gen. 42, 28; 45, 26; **ሐይዎ ልቡ** “his spirit revived (within him)” Gen. 45, 27; **መረረተኒ ነፍሰዩ** “my soul is embittered (within me)” Ruth 1, 13; **ብእሲት እንተ ደም ይውሕዛ** “a woman, who had an issue of blood” Matt. 9, 20 (for which the form of expression in other languages would be **ደማ ይውሕዝ**); **ስምዐኒ ቃልዩ** “hear (me) my voice” Gen 27, 43; **ስምዖ ቃሎ** “he hearkened to (him) his voice” Judges 13, 9; **መተሮ እዝኖ** “he smote off his ear

(1) [DILLMANN seems to mean, both here and throughout this section, that the Dative use of the Verbal Suffix conveys an emphatic reference of the idea which is contained in the verb and its complement, to the personality indicated by the Suffix. TR.]

(from him)” Matt. 26, 51; **ወርእያ : ነፍስታ : ለዲና** “and he saw (her) the person of Dinah” Gen. 34, 3; **ወአእመሮሙ : ኢየሱስ : እከዮሙ** “and Jesus recognised them in their wickedness” or “perceived their wickedness (in them)” Matt. 22, 18; **ይእስሮዎ : እገሪሁ** “they shall bind his feet”⁽¹⁾ Matt. 22, 13; *cf.* also **ይስዎሀን : ቃለን** Judith 8, 17; **አእመረኪ : ሕዝብ : ጥበበኪ** 8, 29; **ኢይፍራህኪ : ልብኪ** 10, 16; in the very same way, for “he called his name so-and-so” the expression is—sometimes, it is true, **ሰመየ : ስሞ** : but with more elegance, **ሰመየ : ስሞ : ሴት** Gen. 4, 25; 3, 20, Note. The Cases mentioned in § 175, *c* all resemble those which are enumerated here, except that in the former group the Person itself is always the proper Subject or Object, and the Part of it which is dealt with, is always in the Accusative of Reference—, while, *vice versâ*, in the group before us, it is the Part which is always the nearest Subject or Object, and the Person itself is mentioned by way of addition and put in the secondary Accusative.

An explanation has thus been given of the most important uses of the Ethiopic Accusative; but of course it is not a matter of necessity that every verb, which is capable of taking an Accusative, should do so always. Even Active verbs and Double Transitives may often stand in a sentence without any Object. This may happen because the Object, being understood from the connection, is suppressed and is not even represented by a Pronoun, *e. g.* Matt. 21, 2 “there shall ye find a she-ass and an ass’s colt, **ፍትሑ : ወአምጽኡ : ሊተ** loose (them) and bring (them) to me”; **ኢትእመኑ** “believe (it) not” Matt. 24, 23; Mark 13, 21; Gen. 9, 2;—or, of two Objects, at least one is omitted: “my house is a house of prayer **ወአንትሙስ : ትሬስዩ : በአተ : ሰረቅት** but ye make (it) a den of thieves” Matt. 21, 13. The same thing may happen too, because these verbs—which in other languages are often better expressed intransitively—yield, of and by themselves, a satisfactory meaning: **ዘያበርህ : ወያውዒ** “which enlightens and warms” (‘diffuses light and warmth’) Hen. 72, 4; **ኢወለደት : ሎቱ** “she did not bear to him” (‘she bare him no children’) Gen. 16, 1:—⁽²⁾; **ያጠምቅ** “he baptised” (without mentioning any Object) Mark 1, 4; **አእመረ** “to know” Matt. 27, 65 (‘to have knowledge about, or to

(1) Which may also be explained according to § 175, *c*.

(2) [*Cf. Kebra Nāg.*, ‘Introd.’ p. XX.]

have skill in"); **አንትሙ : አአምሩ** "see ye to it" Matt. 27, 24; **ፈተወ** ('to wish', 'to desire') "to be willing" Matt. 26, 41 &c.

(b) *Subordination of Nouns and Pronouns by means of Prepositions.*

§ 179. If a Noun cannot be governed in the Accusative by a Verb, in one or other of the modes described in §§ 174—178, it must be subordinated to the Verb by the aid of a *Preposition*. The Dictionary will point out which Prepositions are possible and usual in the case of the several verbs. A good deal has been brought forward incidentally on this head (v. *supra* § 164 *sqq.*) in treating of Prepositions; but the following observations still fall to be added here.

Subordina-
tion of
Nouns and
Pronouns
by means of
Preposi-
tions.

1. Instead of the more strict subordination in the Accusative, the looser form may appear, effected by **ለ**, the preposition of most general reference⁽¹⁾. But upon the whole this has been seldom resorted to, being confined to no more than a few cases. In exemplification of this use of **ለ** as a mere substitute for the Accusative, we find in Gen. 17, 12 **ወለሕፃን : ትገዝሩ** (where **ትገዝርዎ** would have been a more accurate expression) "and the child ye shall circumcise"; farther **እለ : ያዐርቡ : ለክበብ : ፀሐይ** "who cause the orb of the sun to set" Gen. 18, 4; **እስሙ : ለትእምርት : ወለአዝማን : አርአየኒ** "for he showed me the signs and the times" Gen. 75, 3; and **ዘኢያው-ፅአ : ለጽድቁ : ወለርትዑ : እምኔህ** "who hath not withdrawn from him his righteousness and his truth", Gen. 24, 27⁽²⁾; and thus an Accusative-attachment, which has been begun, may be continued in effect by **ለ**, as in **ከሙ : ኢትዒምፀነ : ወኢለዘርእየ** "that thou wilt injure neither ourselves nor my descendants" Gen. 21, 23. The use of **ለ** in exchange for the Accusative is more common in the case of all those verbs which contain the idea of "addressing", inasmuch as the 'reference' in such verbs may be always held to be—the 'speaking to some one'. Thus not only may such words as "to say", "to relate", "to speak" have **ለ** associated with them, quite as readily as the Accusative (§ 176, 3, *a*), but also, in particular, words involving such ideas as "to beg", "to ask", and farther "to praise"

⁽¹⁾ Analogous to the procedure in Aramaic.

⁽²⁾ Cf. *supra*, p. 439, Note ⁽²⁾.

and “to extol” (**በረከ**, **ሰብሐ** &c.), “to call”, “to command”, “to forbid”, “to blame”, (e. g. **ዘለፈ**, Hen. 13, 10), “to reprimand”, and so on. But especially does **ለ** come forward to introduce the *aim* and *purpose*, when a Noun in that signification is subordinated to a Verb. Thus Verbs of Giving govern the person, to whom a thing is given, as much by **ለ** as through the Accusative (§ 177, 4); and the Predicate-Accusative, in particular, (§ 177, 4 & 5) may be replaced by the connection through **ለ**, wherever the notion of a purpose is conceived: **ተሣዩጡ : ምድረ : ለመቃብር** “they bought a field as a burying-ground” Matt. 27, 7; Gen. 49, 30; **ከፈለሙ : ለሠለስቱ : ሰራዊት** “he divided them into three companies” Judges 7, 16; **ሥጋ : ጽድቅ : አቅም : ለተክለ : ዘርእ** “establish the flesh of righteousness as a seed-bearing plant” Hen. 84, 6; **እገብራ : ለበረከት** “I will make it (f.) a blessing” Hen. 45, 4, 5⁽¹⁾ [*cf. Kebra Nag. 5a22*]; **ይትገረይ : በእሴ : ለተክለ : ኅኑኔ : ጽድቅ** “there will be chosen a man to become a plant of the judgment of righteousness” Hen. 93, 5. Thus too **ኮነ** “to serve for something” and “to become something” is associated with **ለ** as readily as with the Accusative (§ 177, 5): **ወኮነ : ለመንፈስ : ሕይወት** “and he became a living soul” Gen. 2, 7; 20, 16; **ወይከውን : ለበረከት : ግብር** “and the doing . . . shall serve as a blessing” Hen. 10, 16; 52, 4; **ይከውኑክሙ : ለዕቅፍት** “they shall become a stumbling-block to you” Judges 2, 3. Now and again too, other prepositions of direction are employed instead: **እብን : ኮነት : ውስተ : ርእሰ : ማእዘንት** “the stone has become the head of the corner” Matt. 21, 42; **ያገብአክ : ውስተ : ሊቀ : ቀዳሕያን** “he will restore thee to the post of cupbearer” Gen. 40, 13; or **ተወለጠ : ጎበ** “to be changed into something (else)” [or with **በ**, *Kebra Nag. 133 b 21*].

As for the rest, the Dative of other languages is generally expressed by **ለ**.

2. Several Verbs, which may govern an Accusative, may also introduce their Object by means of Prepositions, but in that case they generally assume a somewhat different meaning; and the subordination of an Object to a Verb by means of a Preposition corresponds often in its effect to the Compound Verbs of the Indo-European languages: **ሰምዐ** with Accusative means “to hear

(¹) [DILLMANN's reading has the **ለ**-construction in both verses; FLEMMING reads **በረከት** in V. 4, and **ለበረከት** in V. 5, with an identical meaning. TR.]

any one", but with **ለ**, "to listen to" and "to obey"; **ርእየ** with **በ** "to look at anything" Hen. 39, 10; **ጸውዐ** with **ለ** "to call to any one" Gen. 21, 17; **ወረቀ : ላዕለ** "to spit upon one" Matt. 27, 30; **ነጸረ : ውስተ** "to look towards" Gen. 15, 5; **ሰጥየ** with Accusative "to drink anything", but with **እምነ** "to drink of it" Gen. 9, 21 [and with **በ** "to drink out of anything" Gen. 44, 5; *Kebra Nag.* 97 b 1, 3]; **አገዝ** "to hold", "to keep", but with **በ** "to take hold of" Gen. 19, 16; **ነፍሱ** "to breathe", but with **ዲበ** "to breathe upon any one" and "to breathe into *or* inspire any one" Hen. 82, 7 &c. Otherwise whenever a Verb attaches its object to itself by a Preposition, that preposition is chosen to suit the meaning of the Verb, *e. g.* **አበሰ : ለ** "to sin against any one" Judges 10, 10; **ሐዘነ : ለ** "to mourn for any one"; **ሰገደ : ለ** "to bow down to *or* before any one" Gen. 27, 29; 42, 6; **መልከ : ለ**, **ነግሠ : ለ** "to be king over *or* of any one" Judges 9, 8, 22 (and with **ላዕለ** Judges 9, 9); **ርዕደ : እምነ**, **ፈርሀ : እምነ** "to tremble, to fear before", "to be afraid of" Gen. 9, 2; 32, 12; **ጐየ : —ተዐቀበ : እምነ** "to flee from", "to beware of"; **አዕረፈ : እምነ** "to rest from" Hen. 53, 7; **ነጽሐ : እም** "to be pure from anything" Hen. 10, 22; **ተበቀለ : እም** "to take vengeance on" Judges 16, 28; Hen. 54, 6; **ጸለየ : ጎበ** "to pray to", Gen. 20, 17, and similarly **ሰሐለ : ጎበ** Gen. 25, 21; **እምነ : በ** "to believe in"; **ሠምረ : በ**, **ፈተወ : በ** "to have a liking for,—a desire for"; **ቀንኦ : ላዕለ** "to be jealous *or* envious of" Gen. 26, 14; 30, 1 &c. All Verbs too which indicate properties may be compared with other conceptions by means of the comparative word **እምነ** and a few other Prepositions (*v. infra* § 187).

Finally, an author may occasionally associate a Verb in quite a bold and peculiar fashion with a Preposition, which according to its usual sense does not properly belong to the Verb, as **ጸሐፈ** with the Accusative of the thing and **ላዕለ** of the Person, "to record something *on* or *regarding* any one" (*i. e.* "to set to his credit *or* his blame", "to impute") Hen. 10, 8; **ናዘዘ** with **እምነ** "to console one *from* a thing", *i. e.* "to comfort one *about* a thing" Gen. 5, 29; **መልክ : ማይ : ውስተ : ሐመር** "the water filled *into* the ship", *i. e.* "the ship became full of water" Mark 4, 37; *cf.* Ex. 28, 3; **ንቀጥቅጦ : እምድረ : ሕያዋን** Jer. 11, 19; [*cf.* also *Kebra Nag.* 'Glossary', *sub* **ተሥእነ**, **ቀጸበ**, **ወዕኦ**, **ፈነወ** &c.]. But yet these bolder associations are rare, at least in ordinary Ethiopic speech.

Generally speaking, Prepositions are very frequently made

use of in Ethiopic. It is true that the employment of the Accusative in its more ancient significations is still in full activity, and is just as current as in any of the oldest Semitic languages; but side by side with that use, a connection of the words by means of Prepositions is often available; and a certain striving after freedom and variety in word-association is unmistakeably proclaimed even in this department.

2. VERB IN SUBORDINATION TO THE VERB.

1. Second Verb determining (a) Kind and Manner, Circumstances or Time of the action of the First. § 180. Just as the Verb may be supplemented by subordinating to it a Noun or Pronoun, so also may it be supplemented by another Verb. In this case, should the supplementary Verb merely appear as a Substantive-Infinitive, and be governed by the principal verb just like any other noun, special discussion of such an instance would be superfluous here. But in point of fact there are several other methods of subordinating one Verb to another, and these must now be explained.

The sense in which one verb governs another is varied in character.

1. The second verb may define *the kind and manner* of the principal verb, *the more detailed circumstances of the action*, and *its time*.

(a) *When an adverbial determination of Circumstance* has to be joined to the principal Verb (or to the Predicate of the sentence), this is often expressed in Ethiopic by a Verb,—partly because adverbial expressions of this character in a fully formed condition are comparatively few, and partly because such determination of circumstance may have to be more strongly emphasised than is possible with an adverbial expression. In such a case the two verbs may be united together, mainly in the following two ways:—

a) By the two Verbs being set side by side without **ω**.

(α) The pair of verbs are set side by side, in the same tense, mood, number and person, not connected however by the usual **ω**, but remaining unconnected; and by that arrangement, since there is no Copula coming between them, they are the more closely linked together. In this way are attached, in particular, certain adverbial conceptions of Time and Place, of the most general sense, which precede the principal verb, while completing the idea conveyed in it. Thus, although the sentence “and she bare again”

may be expressed with the help of an adverb in Ethiopic also: **ወወለደት : ዓዲ**, *e. g.* in Gen. 29, 34, yet, if this “again” has to be emphasised, it is expressed by **ደገመ** “to repeat”: **ወደገመት : ወለደት** “and again she bare” Gen. 4, 2; 29, 33; **ደገመ : ፈነወ** “again he sent”, although **ወዳገመ : ፈነወ** may also occur, Luke 20, 11; so too in Judges 20, 22; Gen. 25, 1. In the same way **ወድክ** “he has finished” serves to indicate the idea of “already” (v. § 88): **እሳት : ወድክት : ነደት** “the fire is already kindled” Luke 12, 49; **ወዳእነ : ግእዝነ** “we have already reprehended” Rom. 3, 9; Numb. 17, 11, 12; 22, 29, 33; Matt. 5, 28; 11, 21; 17, 12; and this word may even be placed after the principal verb: **ወመስየሂ : ወድክ : ሰዐት** “and the evening hour has already come” Mark 6, 35⁽¹⁾. — *Cf.* farther **ወፅኡ : ተቀበልዎሙ** “they went out against them” Judges 1, 10; **ሐሩ : ተቀበልዎሙ** “go ye out to meet them” Josh. 9, 9; **ተገሥኡ : ንሐር** “arise! let us go” Gen. 33, 12; 27, 19; Josh. 7, 13; **ንበር : ትትኔበይ : ሎሙ** “remain thou prophesying to them” *Chrest.* page 3, line 22 *sq.* &c. In such unions, it is true, the two verbs frequently occur also, joined by means of **ወ**; but the better manuscripts avoid this.

(β) Still more frequently the principal verb is subordinated in the Accusative of the Infinitive to those verbs which determine Time or Circumstance; and every verb, whether Active or Passive, may be subordinated in this way, by taking the form of the Substantive-Infinitive. The governing Verb, which contains the adverbial and auxiliary determination, is mostly transitive or causative, but it may also be reflexive-passive; and the Accusative of the Infinitive in the latter case is to be explained in accordance with § 174. Thus: **ተገምሩ : ዐዲወ** “they had all crossed over” (“they had all been included in the crossing over”) Josh. 4, 8, 11; **ቀደምኩ : ነጊሮተክሙ** “I have told you before” Matt. 24, 25; 12, 29; 17, 11; **ከፍጠንክን : መጹክ** (= **ፍጡነ : መጸእክን**) “ye (f.) are come soon” Ex. 2, 18; Gen. 18, 7; Josh. 4, 10; **ኅበርክሙ : ክሚነ : ምስሌየ** “you have believed along with me” Rom. 1, 12; **ኢይ**

(β) By the Verb of Principal Action being subordinated in the Acc. of the Inf. to the Verb of Circumstance or Time.

⁽¹⁾ Precisely in the case of **ወድክ** the tense as a rule agrees with that of the leading verb: both are in the Perfect. But yet, to express a Present, **ወድክ** is also joined to the Imperfect: **ወድክ : ማሕጺ : ውስተ : ጉንድ : ይነበር** “already lies the axe beside the stem” Matt. 3, 10. It is unnecessary to assume an adverb **ወድክ** here.

ደግሞ : እንከ : ሀልዎ : ምስሌክሙ “I will continue to be with you no longer” Josh. 7, 12; Gen. 8, 12; 38, 26; **አኅለቁ : ተሴስዮ : እክለ** “they had eaten up the corn” Gen. 43, 2; Josh. 8, 24; 10, 20; **አሠ ነዩ : ገቢረ** “he has done good” Judges 17, 13; **አቅደመት : አእምሮ** “she had informed herself before” Matt. 14, 8; 17, 25; **አፈድፈዱ : ጸሊኡቶ** “they hated him still more” Gen. 37, 8; Matt. 27, 23; **ሰለ ጠ : መዊተ** “he was already quite dead” John 19, 33; **አብዝነት : አብአ** “she brought most” Luke 21, 3; **ማይ : ያርሕቅ : ቀዊመ** “the water stood up afar” Josh. 3, 16. An Abstract also may occur instead of the Infinitive, *e. g.* **ዘአዝለፈ : ትዕግሥቶ** “who is steadfastly patient” Matt. 24, 13.

§ 181. (b) If a more exact determination of the Kind and Manner, of the Circumstances or of the Time is attached to a verb, and if it is a determination which can only be expressed by means of a verbal form, then Ethiopic has various devices for expressing it.

(α) The auxiliary qualification may be subordinated in the form of the *Gerund* (§ 123). In that case the Infinitive itself takes the Accusative, in accordance with § 174 *sq.*, but only in rare instances does it appear without a suffix, as in **ነሎ : ግለመ : ፈጸመ : እግዚአብሔር : ገቢረ : ግብር** “God completed the whole world, carrying out his work” Gen. 2, 2. Nearly always, in fact, the Subject which performs the subordinated action,—whether it be at the same time the Subject of the leading proposition or its Object,—is yet more specially expressed by a Suffix Pronoun appended to the Infinitive. Thus determinations of condition are expressed, as in **ተዐጊሠከ : አዕምአኒ** “hear me patiently” Acts 26, 3; **ወወፅአ : ተዐጊሦ** “and he went out, putting restraint on himself” Gen. 43, 31; and even **ሀለወ : ነዊሞ** “he was ‘sleeping’”, *i. e.* “he was just then asleep”. Still more frequently are thus expressed determinations of Time (and even conditions bordering upon determinations of Time), which may be understood as referring to Past, Present or Future, according to the context, as the Infinitive has no distinction of tenses: **ወፈሊሶ : እምሀዩ : ሖረ : ውስተ : ምክራብ** “and departing thence he betook himself to the Synagogue” Matt. 12, 9; **ወወረዶ : እምሐመር : ተቀበሎ : ሶቤሃ : ብኢሲ** “and on his coming out of the ship there met him then a man” Mark 5, 2; **ዐርቦ : ፀሐይ : በጸሐሙ : ገባአ** “the sun went down as they reached Gibeah” Judges 19, 14; **ዘይበቀላ : በዘርኡ : ተዘሪአ** “which sprouts by its

Second
Verb ex-
pressing
(b) more
exact Deter-
mination
of Time,
Circum-
stance &c.:—
(α) By the
Gerund.

own seed, when it is sown” Gen. 1, 29; **ወሰሚዖ : ሄሮድስ : ደንገፀ** “and when Herod heard, he was alarmed” Matt. 2, 3; **ሐዊረከሙ : ተሰአሉ** “going away, enquire ye” Matt. 2, 8; **መጽኡ : ሠኒቆሙ : ወአስተዳሊዎሙ** “they came, after they had collected provision for a journey and made their preparations” Josh. 9, 2; **እንተ : መሊአ : አዕረጉ** “which, when it was full, they drew up” Matt. 13, 48; **መኑ : እኩየ : ከዊኖ : ዘቆመ : ቅድሚሁ** Job 9, 4; and so almost on every page of a historical narrative. Even when the Circumstantial or Temporal clause has a Subject of its own, which is not mentioned in the Principal Clause either as Subject or as Object, the Gerund may appear. The Subject is then,—after having been referred to by the Suffix of the Infinitive,—adjoined independently to this Suffix, and in its primary form (not in the Accusative): **ወወፂአ : ውእቱ : ቦኡ : ደቁ** “and when he was gone out, his servants came” Judges 3, 24; **ወኅሊፎ : ሰብዐቱ : ዓመት : ዘጽጋብ : አኅዘ : ይምጸእ : ሰብዐቱ : ዓመት : ዘረኃብ** “and when the seven years of plenty had passed away, the seven years of famine began to come” Gen. 41, 53; **ኅሊፎ : መዋዕል : ብዙኅ** Job 2, 9; **ወተወሊዶ : ኢየሱስ : ናሁ : መሰግላን : በጽሑ** “and when Jesus was born, behold there came wise men” Matt. 2, 1; or, with the Infinitive of Impersonal Verbs: **ወምሴተ : ከዊኖ : አምጽኡ** “and when evening was come, they brought” Matt. 8, 16; 26, 20; **ወመስየ : መጽኡ : ብእሲ** “and when it was evening, there came a man” Matt. 27, 57.

(β) When the auxiliary qualification sets forth a condition of the Acting Subject of the Principal Verb (a condition which is expressed in other languages by a Participle, co-ordinated with the Subject), it may be expressed by an Imperfect, ranked alongside of the Principal Verb, the Imperfect being the proper tense to describe a condition or circumstance (§ 89). In this case, however, as in similar cases (§ 180, 1, *a, α*), the copula **ወ** must always be left out, in order that by such close connection the subordination of the accessory idea to the principal one may be signified. It is unnecessary in such a case to have the two verbs placed immediately together; several words, according to circumstances, may intervene, *e. g.*: **ነበሩ : የዐቅብዎ** “they sat down, watching him” Matt. 27, 36; **ትሰክብ : ትፈፅን** “she is laid down sick of a fever” Matt. 8, 14; **ይገንዩ : ዘቦሙ : ጥበብ : ኢይደግሙ : አብሶ** “those who possess wisdom will humble themselves, no more

(β) By the Imperfect without **ወ**.

committing sin" Hen. 5, 8; **አመ : ጎደግምዎ : ትገብኡ : ውስተ : እሉ : አሕዛብ** "if ye forsake him, turning back to those nations" Josh. 23, 12; **ወይነውም : በሕቲቱ : ይፈርህ** G. Ad. 93, 19; [**ኢያክትት : . . . ይሄሉ** *Kebra Nag.* 114 b 20 sq.]. On this usage rests also the periphrasis of the Latin Imperfect through the employment of **ሀለወ** with the Imperfect (§ 89), as in **ሀሉ : ያጠምቅ** "he baptised" ('was baptising'). Cf. also § 189 sq. When, on the other hand, the auxiliary qualification does not exactly express a condition of the Subject, but a continuation rather of the principal action, then it is put in the same Tense as the Principal verb, and is ranked beside it without farther connection: **ወነሥኡ : አዋልዲሆሙ : አውሰቡ** "and they took their daughters in marriage" (*lit.* 'and they took their daughters,—they married') Judges 3, 6; **መጽኦ : እቶን : ዘይጠይስ : ጎለፈ** "and there came a smoking furnace, passing by" &c. Gen. 15, 17; **ወፅአት : . . . ጎሠሠት** "she went away, . . . seeking" Hen. 85, 6 (*cf.* § 180, 1, a, α).

(γ) Qualifying Verb being introduced by Conjunction, such as **እንዘ** &c.

(γ) Besides, for the cases mentioned, and for the attachment of every auxiliary qualification which has to be expressed by a Verb,—whether it be a qualification of Kind, Circumstance or Time, Conjunctions are available (§ 189), such as **እንዘ** "while, when", **ሶበ** &c., and these are very frequently used for this purpose.

(δ) When the Qualifying Verb is represented by the Subst. Inf. of Principal Verb.

(δ) A special Case occurs, when a Verb has its own Substantive-Infinitive in the Accusative associated with it by way of supplement (*cf.* § 174),—in which case the particular force of such a mode of expression may differ in character. The repetition of the Verb must either signify the repetition of the action itself, and thus express the gradual, continuous or complete nature of that action: **ወደምስሶ : ደምስስዎሙ** "and destroying they destroyed them" (action gradually becoming complete) Judges 20, 43; **አብዝኖ : አበዝኅ** "multiplying I will multiply" ('I will make many and ever more') Gen. 3, 16; 16, 10; or else such repetition is meant to direct forcibly the attention of the hearer to the conception, and lend strong emphasis to the Verb. The latter use of the Infinitive is the more frequent of the two by far: **ሰሚዐ : ትሰምዑ : ወኢትሌብወ** "you hear indeed, but you do not understand" Matt. 13, 14; Mark 4, 12; **ባርኮ : እባርክክ** "bless thee I will" Gen. 22, 17; **ነጌሠኑ : ትነግሥ : ላዕሌን** "shalt thou indeed reign over us?" Gen. 37, 8; **ወቀቲለሰ : ኢንቀትለክ** "but kill thee we shall not" Judges 15, 13; **አእምሮ : አእምር** "know thou assuredly" Gen. 15, 13; farther,

Gen. 20, 18; 50, 16; Judges 8, 25; [**አምሕሎ : አምሕለከ** *Kebra Nag.* 166b 13sq.], &c. The Infinitive stands at the beginning of such clauses, as these examples show, but it may also be put at the end, particularly when it indicates the continuance of the action: **ከመ : ያምልከዎ : አምልኮ : ለእግዚአብሔር** “that they may ever continue to worship God” Josh. 22, 27; also **ዘከነ : ከዊኖ** “whatever it may be” Ex. 22, 8; Gal. 5, 10; **አንክሩ : አንክሮ** “wonder ye greatly” *Gadla Yārēd* (ed. CONTI ROSSINI, 1904) p. 5, l. 5.

§ 182. 2. The Subordinate Verb may have the force of a Determination of the *Contents* of the leading Verb, or the force of an *Object* thereto, and then it is always to be thought of as in the Objective Case.

(a) The most obvious mode of union in this case, is that by which (α) the Subordinate Verb takes the form of the Accusative of the Substantive-Infinitive. This mode is allowable and very common, even when the Subordinate Verb has objects depending on it. The Infinitive in that case is either regarded more in the light of a Noun governing its Object by means of the Construct State relation (v. p. 463) or more in the light of a Verb, although there is no necessity that it should take the Gerund-form, governing its Object in the Accusative or by means of Prepositions. First of all, there are certain verbs which convey no sense by themselves, —viz. Auxiliary Verbs, and particularly Verbs of *Being able*, or *Being unable*—, but which connect themselves for the most part with such Infinitives: **ኢይክል : ኀዲገ : አቡሁ** “he cannot leave his father” Gen. 44, 22; **ወነፍሰክሙሰ : ኢይክሉ : ቀቲለ** “but are not able to kill your soul”; **ዘይክል : ነፍሰ : ወሥጋ : ኀቡረ : አሕጉሎ** “who is able to destroy soul and body together” Matt. 10, 28; 9, 15, 28; 7, 18; 5, 14, 36; 3, 9; **ስእንክሙ : ተጊህ** “could ye not watch?” Matt. 26, 40; **ስእነ : አውፅአቶ** “could not we cast him out?” Matt. 17, 19; Josh. 17, 12; and farther, other Verbs in which the idea leans to that of *Being able*, like “to know” (‘how to do &c.’), “to love” (‘to do &c.’), “to be accustomed” (‘to do &c.’): **ያለምድ : አሕይዎ : አሐደ** “he was accustomed to grant one person his life” Matt. 27, 15; **ታአምሩ : ሠናየ : ሀብተ : ውሂበ** “ye know how to give good gifts” Matt. 7, 11; 16, 3; **ያፈቅሩ : ቀዊመ : ወጸልዮ** “they love to stand and to pray” Matt. 6, 5; farther, Verbs of *Hindering*, *Refusing*, and *Being unwilling*—(in contrast with which, Verbs of *Willing*, as expressing a purpose, have

2. Second Verb determining the Contents of the Leading Verb:—
(a) In the form of the Acc. of the Subst.-Inf. of Subordinate Verb.; or
(β) in the form of a Finite Verb introduced by a Conjunction.

mostly a different manner of connection): **ትከልእዎሙ : በዊኦ** “ye hinder them from entering” Matt. 23, 14 (*cf.* § 176, 3, *a*); Hen. 63, 10; **ኢትከልእዎሙ : መጸኢ : ኀቤዩ** “forbid them not to come unto me” Matt. 19, 14; Judges 15, 1; **ራሔል : ተአቢ : ተናዝዞ** “Rachel refuses to be comforted” Matt. 2, 18; **አበዩከ : ውሂበ** “they refuse to give thee” Gen. 24, 41; 37, 35; **ርእዮቶ : ከሕዱ** ἰδεῖν ἀρνούνται Sap. 17, 10 A. But several other Verbs also,—which in some cases admit of other methods of union,—may join to themselves the Accusative of the Infinitive: **ነቢረ : በዩማንዩ : አኮ : አነ : ዘአሁብ** “to sit on my right hand it is not I who grant” Matt. 20, 23; **ጡበዐ : ተስኢሎቶ** “ventured (3 *sing.*) to ask him” Matt. 22, 46; **ረስዑ : ኀበስተ : ነሢኦ** “they had forgotten to take bread with them” Matt. 16, 5; **ይጉንዲ : አቲወ** “he delayeth to come” Matt. 24, 48; **ፈርሀ : ሐዊረ : ሀዩ** “he was afraid to go thither” Matt. 2, 22; 1, 20; Gen. 19, 30; **ትኅድጉ : ተሊዎቶ : ለእግዚአብሔር** “(in that) ye cease to follow the Lord” Josh. 22, 16, 18, 29; Gen. 11, 6; *cf.* besides, § 180, 1, *a*, *β*. It may happen too that the governing Verb is supplemented beforehand by a Suffix referring to the Object of the subordinate Verb,—a practice which again forms a delicate turn in the Ethiopic language, similar to that which is described in § 178: **እክሎ : ነሢቶቶ : ለቤተ : እግዚአብሔር** “I am able to destroy the house of God” Matt. 26, 61; **መኑ : ይክሎ : ለዝንቱ : ገቢረ** 4 Esr. 2, 6. Indeed the governing Verb may even attract completely to itself the Object of the dependent verb, if that Object is merely a pronoun: **ስእንዎ : ፈውሶ** “they could not heal him” Matt. 17, 16 (for **ስእኑ : ፈውሶቶ**).—The subordinated Infinitive may pass into a finite Verb, as the sentence goes on, and *vice versâ*, *e. g.*: **ተመዩጦሙ : ለሐዊር : ወጉጉኦ : ፈነውዎሙ** “turning to go and pursue them more swiftly” Sap. 19, 2; **ይደልዎሙ : ይትከልኦሙ : ብርሃን : ወተሞቅሖ : ውስተ : ጽልመት** “they deserve to be shut out from the light and to be cast into the chains of darkness” Sap. 18, 4.—In the same way also the Subject-Infinitive may be passed on, *e. g.* 4 Esr. 13, 20.

Strangely enough even Impersonal Verbs (§ 192) may be completed by an Infinitive in the Accusative, though other constructions may be employed. Thus in particular **ኮነ** is often joined to the Accusative of the Infinitive, when it has the meaning of ἔστι, ἔξεστι, “it is possible” or “it is lawful or permitted”: **ዘኢይከውን : ገቢረ** “which is not lawful to do” Matt. 12, 2; **ይከውን :**

በሰንበት : ገቢረ : ሠናይ “it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day” Matt. 12, 12; 12, 10; Deut. 22, 19; **ኢይትዐጸብከ : ፈንዎቶ** “let it not seem hard to thee (§ 178) to let him go free” Deut. 15, 18; **እመ : ኢይትከሀል : ዝኅሊፈ** “if it is not possible that this pass away” Matt. 26, 42; **ኢኮነ : ሠናየ : ነሢኦ : ኅብስተ : ውሉድ : ወውረበ : ለከለባት** “it is not proper to take the children’s bread and to give it to the dogs” Matt. 15, 26; **ይቀልል : በአተ : (§ 124, beginning) ገመል : እንተ : ስቀረተ : መርፍእ : እምባዕል : በዊኦ : መንግሥተ : እግዚአብሔር** “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God” Matt. 19, 24 (*cf.* 9, 5); **ኮነክመ : ዐዊዶቶ : ለዝንቱ : ደብር** (“there has been for you enough of the compassing of this mountain”) “you have compassed this mountain long enough” Deut. 2, 3⁽¹⁾. Such unions are explained most readily by the consideration that in thought the impersonal turn of the Verb is replaced by a personal one (*e. g.* “it is lawful” is thought of as “we may” or “one may”). Meanwhile, this construction is not absolutely necessary: the complement may be applied to such verbs in the Subject- or Nominative-case, and then they cease to be impersonal: **ሊተ : ይኔይሰኒ : መዊት** “it is better for me to die” 1 Cor. 9, 15; **አሉ : ቀዳሚ : ይኔይስ : ብሂል** Hen. 37, 3; **የዐጽባ : ወሊድ** “it becomes hard for her to bring to the birth” Hen. 62, 4; **አከለክመ : በሊዕ** “it is sufficient for you,—to eat” Hen. 102, 9 (*cf.* Hebr. 9, 27; 10, 31). In the case of Infinitives in *ō* it is impossible to discern which of the two constructions they are following, *e. g.* in **አኮ : ሠናይ : አውስቦ** “then it is not good to marry” Matt. 19, 10, inasmuch as **አውስቦ** may be Nominative as well as Accusative.

On the Accusative with the Infinitive after Verbs of *Saying* and *Perceiving*, v. § 190.

(β) When this, the most obvious form of union, is not found practicable, a Conjunction like **ከመ**, **ዘ**, **እስመ** or other similar form, is employed, *e. g.* “he said, *that* &c.”; *cf.* § 203.

(b) If the verb to be subordinated is related to the principal verb,—rather *as the intended result* or *the aim*—, it takes the following forms.

(¹) An instance in which **ሀሎ** is first construed with the Subjunctive, and afterwards with the Accusative of the Infinitive, is met with in Sap. 16, 28 A.

(b) Forms adopted by Second Verb to express intended Result or Aim of Principal Verb:—

(α) Subst.-Inf. with **Λ** prefixed;
(β) Subjunctive without Conjunction.

(α) The connection may be effected,—though this method is seldom adopted upon the whole,—by means of **Λ** followed by the Substantive-Infinitive, (v. also § 183), *e. g.*: **ዘኢይከውኖ : ለበሊዕ** “which was not lawful for him to eat” Matt. 12, 4⁽¹⁾.

(β) Most frequently the Subjunctive is employed, which is subordinated to the principal verb, just like an Accusative, directly, that is, without any Conjunction. It occurs particularly after verbs of *Willing, Wishing, Begging, Commanding, Permitting, Promising* and *Beginning*: **አዘዘ : የሀቡ** “he commanded (that) they should give” Matt. 19, 7; 27, 64; **ይቤ : ይትዐቀቡ** “he said (‘commanded that’) they should beware” Matt. 16, 12; Hen. 69, 14; **እመ : ትፈቅድ : ፍጹመ : ትኩን** “if thou wilt be perfect” Matt. 19, 21; 12, 46; 14, 5; Josh. 24, 15; Hen. 39, 8; **እመ : ፈቀድክ : ይዕበይ** &c. *Chrest.* p. 42, line 6; **ፈተዉ : ይርአዩ** “they have desired to see” Matt. 13, 17; **የኅሥሡ : ይትናገሩክ** “they seek to speak with thee” Matt. 12, 47; **ኅድጉ : ይልሀቁ : ኅቡረ** “let them grow together” Matt. 13, 30; 24, 43; 27, 49; **ሰአዎ : ያርአዮሙ** “they asked him that he should show them” Matt. 16, 1; **አብሐኒ : እንብብ** “suffer me to speak” Gen. 18, 32; 31, 7; **አስተብቁዕዎ : ይኅልፍ** “they besought him that he should depart” Matt. 8, 34; **የሀብክን : እግዚአብሔር : ትርከባ : ዕረፍተ** “the Lord grant (you) that you may find rest” Ruth 1, 9; **አኀዘ : ይስብክ** “he began to preach” Matt. 4, 17; **አኃዘ : (for አኀዘ :) ይሰብሕ : ወይቀድስ : ወይዘምር : ለእግዚአብሔር** “he began to laud, bless and praise God” *Gadla Yārēd*, p. 6, l. 24 sq., and very frequently. The same construction is found also with many other verbs of like signification, *e. g.*: **መሀርዎሙ : ይዕቀቡ** “teach them to observe” Matt. 28, 20 (with the secondary idea of ‘charging’); **አልጸቀት : ትሙት** “she was at the point of death” (‘was about to die’) Mark 5, 23; **ተበዋሕኩ : እትናገር** “I have taken upon me to speak” Gen. 18, 31; also with **ክህለ**, *e. g.* in Hen. 14, 21⁽²⁾; Hexaëm. 9, 20; and with other words that suggest *Ability*, *e. g.* **ወኢኮነ : ሎሙ : አእምሮ : ይፃኡ : ወኢይዕርጉ** Hexaëm. 9, 16 sq.; and with Verbs of *Hoping*, *e. g.* **ተሰፈወ : ያዕርፍ** (var. **ያዕርፍ**)

(1) **לֹא-יֵאָכַל** Jer. 35, 14, even with its negation, is rendered in the *Cod. Francof.* by **ለኢሰትዩ : ወይን**.

(2) [This passage, Hen. 14, 21, exhibits the peculiarity of presenting in the same verse and with the same meaning **ክህለ** followed by an Inf. and **ክህለ** followed by a Subjunctive. TR.]

Sir. 11, 19.—In the very same way too Impersonal Verbs are connected with the Subj. (v. *supra*, a): **ይኤድመክሙ : ትረስዩ** “it pleases you to do” Josh. 9, 23; **ኢኮነ : ሠናይ : ይንበር : ባሕቲቱ** “it is not good that he should be alone” Gen. 2, 18; **ኢይከውነከ : ታውስባ** “it is not permitted thee to take her to wife” Matt. 14, 4; Deut. 22, 29; **ኢይደልወኒ : እድንን** “it befits not me to stoop down” or “I am not worthy to stoop down” Mark 1, 7; Matt. 3, 11, 15; **ይኔይሰከ : ትባእ** “it is better for thee to enter” Matt. 18, 8, 9; **አኮ : መፍትው : ይሐሩ** (“it is not necessary that they go away”) “they need not depart” Matt. 14, 16; 23, 23; [*Kebra Nag.* 46 b 14]. To this class belongs also **ሀለዎ** with the Subjunctive (§ 89).

(γ) In most of the instances, however, cited under (β), the Subjunctive may also be introduced by the conjunction **ከመ**:—**አስተብቀዕዎ : ከመ : ይልከፉ** “they besought him that they might touch” Matt. 14, 36; **ኢይደግም : ከመ : እፈኑ** “I will not send again” Hen. 10, 22; **ይቤለነ : ከመ : ኢንብላዕ** “he told us that we must not eat” Gen. 3, 3; **መሐለ : ከመ : የሀባ** “he promised with an oath to give her” Matt. 14, 7; **ገሠጸሙ : ከመ : አልቦ : ለዘይንግሩ** “he charged them to tell no man” Matt. 16, 20; v. also § 203. Even after Impersonal Verbs **ከመ** with the Subjunctive may be employed: **ይኔይሰከ : ከመ : ይትሐጉል** “it is better for thee that (one member) perish” Matt. 5, 29, 30; **ኢይትፈቀድ : ከመ : ይትሐጉል** “it is not desired that (one) should perish” Matt. 18, 14; **ኢይደልወኒ : ከመ : አንተ : ትባእ** “it is not befitting me (*i. e.* ‘I am not worthy’) that thou shouldest come” Matt. 8, 8; **ብዉሃ : ሎቱ : ከመ** with the Subjunctive, “he has power to—” Mark 2, 10. In the same way we have **ኮነ** with **ከመ** and the Subjunctive, Deut. 24, 4. Even **ከሀለ** is connected thus, though very rarely: **መኑ : ዘይክል : ከመ : የሐሊ : ሕሊናሁ** “Who is able to think his own thoughts?” Hen. 93, 11.

(δ) Verbs of *Beginning* and *Ceasing*, which in other languages are joined with a Participle, are very frequently connected in Ethiopic by **እንዘ**, and usually with an Imperfect coming after it: **አንዙ : እንዘ : ይወግኦ : ፩ ለካልኡ** “they began pushing one another” Hen. 87, 1; 89, 72. The same construction is found with **ወጠነ** Hen. 89, 15 &c.

(δ) Usage with Verbs of Beginning and Ceasing.

§ 183. 3. Finally, just as a Verb may have dependent upon it, besides its proximate Object, other Nouns with the force of a Dative or of other relations, so a verb may be approached by a

3. Second
Verb as
Remote
Object,
specifying
Direction,
Purpose or
Conse-
quence of
Principal
Action:—
(a) In the
Infinitive.

second verb, not as a proximate Object, but as a more remote Object, in order to specify the *direction*, the *purpose* or the *consequence* of the principal action. This is particularly the case with Verbs of *Moving, Making, Giving, Constraining, and Occasioning*.

(a) The Verb, which has to be subordinated, may in these circumstances stand in the *Infinitive*. The idea of Purpose is thereupon given expression to, either by putting the Infinitive in the Accusative of Direction (§ 174): **ዘቦ : አእዛነ : ሰሚዐ : ለይስማዕ** “who hath ears to hear, let him hear” Matt. 11, 15; 13, 9, 43; **ፈርሀ : ቤተ : አቡሁ : በዊክ : መግልተ** “he was afraid of his father’s household, so as not to come by day” (or “should he come by day”) Judges 6, 27; **ኢትትሀከዩ : ሐዊረ : ወበዊክ** “be not ye slothful to depart and to come” Judges 18, 9;—or again,—which is more usual,—by introducing the Infinitive through **ለ**:—“they shall show signs **ለአስሕቶ : . . . ለኅፋያንሂ** so as to lead astray . . . the very elect” Matt. 24, 24; **ይኩኑ : ለአብርሃ** “let them serve to lighten” Gen. 1, 15; **በጸሕነ : ለኅዲር** “we came to put up (for the night)” Gen. 43, 21; **እስርዎሙ : ከላስስተ : ለአንድዶቶሙ** “bind them in sheaves, to burn them” Matt. 13, 30; **አጽንዐት : ለሐዊር** “she insisted upon going” Ruth 1, 18; Gen. 9, 11; 18, 2; 37, 18: also Gen. 2, 9.

(b) In the
Subjunctive
without
Conjunc-
tion.

(b) But much more frequently still, the Verb which has to be subordinated, is added immediately, in the Subjunctive: **ፈነወ : አግብርተ : ይጸውዑ** “he sent forth servants to call” Matt. 22, 3, 7; Josh. 8, 2; **ወለአከኒ : እንግርክ : ዘንተ** “and he commissioned me to tell this to thee” *Gadla Ferē-Mikā’ēl* (ed. TURATIEFF, 1905), p. 9, l. 3; **መጽክ : ይኅሥሥ** “he came to seek” Matt. 18, 11; [**ዘኅለፈ : ይኅሥሥ** “who was travelling about in search of (‘to seek’)” *Chrest.* p. 93, l. 24]; **ኢይረድ : ይንሣእ** “let him not come down, to take—” Matt. 24, 17; **ዐርጉ : ይትቃተልዎሙ** “they went up to fight against them” Josh 22, 12; [**ተንሥክ : ይቅትሎሙ** “he rose to kill them” *Kebra Nag.* 64 a 15]; **ዐበጥዎ : ይጹር** “they compelled him to carry—” Matt. 27, 32; **ወሀብዎ : ይስተይ** “they gave him to drink” Matt. 27, 34; Gen. 3, 12; **ኅሬከምዎ : ለእግዚእ : ታምልከዎ** “ye have chosen the Lord, to serve him” Josh. 24, 22; **ወእመ : ኮነከ : ትቅትለኒ** “and if thou must of necessity slay me” = **وان كان لا بد لك من قتلى** G. Ad. 89, 3; **ይሬስዮ : ይትነፋኅ** “it (wine) makes it (the body) become bloated” *Chrest.* p. 41, line 13; **ሰፍሐት : እድዊሃ : ኅበ : እግዚአብሔር : ትኅሥሥ : እምኔሁ** G. Ad. 8, 8 sq.; specially too in

the case of verbs of *Guarding against*: **ዑቁ : ኢትንሥኡ** “beware lest ye take” Josh. 6, 18.

(c) **ከመ** with the Subjunctive is also available, however, in this case, and it is occasionally made use of, although the method of connection without **ከመ** is more elegant, *e. g.*: **ፈነወ : ኣግብርተ : ከመ : ይንሥኡ** “he sent forth servants, to fetch” Matt. 21, 34; **ኣገበሮሙ : ከመ : ይፅረጉ** “he obliged them to go up” Matt. 14, 22. The difference between the constructions in (b) and (c) is shown in the following example: **ኣምጽኡ : ሊተ : እብላፅ : ወከመ : ትብርክ : ነፍስየ** “bring (it) me (1) to eat (2) that my soul may bless (thee)” Gen. 27, 4. And,—speaking generally,—the less an indication of purpose is involved in the fundamental idea of the Principal Verb, and the more loosely such purpose is added to it in conception, the more readily is choice made of the looser connection by means of **ከመ**.

4. Verbs, just like Nouns, are subordinated to Verbs with the help of *Prepositions*. The Verb to be subordinated must in that case take the form of the Substantive-Infinitive, which is governed by the Preposition, *e. g.* **ነሳሕኩ : በእንተ : ፈጠሮትየ : ከያሆሙ** “I repent of my having created them” Gen. 6, 7; **ኢያእመረ : በሰከቦታ : ወበተንሥኦታ** “he perceived not when she lay down nor when she arose” Gen. 19, 33; **ኣስርሐዋ : በነቢብ : ነላ : ሌሊተ** “she wearied him with talking the whole night” Judges 16, 16; **ውስተ : ወሊድ** “in giving birth” Gen. 35, 16; **ለመዊት** “to die” (‘for dying’) Gen. 47, 29 &c. Instead of such a construction, which is not farther distinguished from the subordination of any Noun to a Verb by means of a Preposition (§ 179), the action to be subordinated may also be expressed by a finite tense introduced by the Conjunction which corresponds to the preposition concerned,—as in **ነስሐ : በእንተ : ዘገብሮ : ለሰብእ** “he repented that he had created man” Gen. 6, 6 (*cf. infra* § 203).

(c) In the Subjunctive with **ከመ**.

4. Second Verb subordinated as Subst.-Inf. with the help of Prepositions.

III. COMBINATION OF NOUNS WITH ONE ANOTHER.

§ 184. The only two possible ways of joining individual words together are, in general terms, by Co-ordination and Subordination. Even in the department of Verbs, Co-ordination may take place, but its appearance there (v. the instances cited in §§ 180, 1, *a, α* and 181, *β*) is far less common than in the depart-

(a) The Genitive Relation:—
1. The Construct State.

ment of Nouns, in which both methods of Word-connection frequently occur.

1. SUBORDINATION OF NOUNS.

The characteristic device for subordinating one Noun to another is,—by § 144,—the Genitive Relation. When this does not suffice, the two Nouns may be referred to one another by the intervention of Prepositions; and with certain classes of Nouns which approximate the Verb, the subordination may be effected even by the Accusative.

(a) *The Genitive Relation.*

1. The first device we meet with, for expressing the Genitive Relation, is the *Status Constructus*, the *Construct State* (§ 144). All Nouns in Ethiopic (Substantives, Adjectives, Infinitives, Numerals) may take the Construct State, with the exception of Pronouns and Proper Names. Other languages may, at least in case of need, admit even of Proper Names in the Constr. State; but Ethiopic has the less need of this, as it possesses other current expedients for indicating the relation of the Genitive. In like manner all kinds of Nouns are capable of becoming dependent upon a Constr. State, *e. g.* **ማሕመመ : ወሊድ** “the pains of child-birth” Gen. 35, 17; **መዋዕለ : ወሊድታ** “the days for her giving birth” Gen. 25, 24; **አዋልደ : ውእቱ : ብሔር** “the daughters of that land” Gen. 34, 1; **ደመ : ዝክቱ** “the blood of that (man)” Gen. 9, 6; **ወለተ : መኑ : አንቲ** “whose daughter art thou?” Gen. 24, 23; **አግብርቲሁ** “his servants”; even **ቀጥለ : ቀዳመ** “the battle of the ‘at-first’” *i. e.* “the earlier battle” Judges 20, 39; also Relatives: **እደ : ዘይትጌገል** “the hand of him who oppresses”. And the *meaning* which attaches to this relation is just as wide and manifold as the meaning found in the word-compounding process,—in the case of Nouns—, in Indo-European languages.

(a) Relation
of
Possession.

(a) It is most frequently employed to express the *Genitive* in the narrower sense, or the relation of Possession, and Being-possessed, as in **ንጉሠ : ምድር** “the king of the land”; **አቡሁ** “his father”. In such a case, if the word which stands in the Constr. State is the name of a Person or of an Object, the dependent word is always *Genitivus subjectivus*; but if the first word is an Abstract word, the dependent word may be either *Genitivus sub-*

jectivus or *objectivus*: **ፍርሀት : ብእሳ** means either “the fear of the man”,—*i. e.* ‘the fear which the man experiences’, or “the fear with respect to the man”—*i. e.* ‘the fear with which the man is regarded’; **እምግርማው** “for fear of him” Matt. 14, 26; **ማዕቀፍዩ** “an offence unto me” Matt. 16, 23; **ከነኔ : ከሉ** “judgment on all” Hen. 22, 8. Even Adjectives may take such Constr. State, if they are understood rather in the sense of Substantives: **ኅያላነ : ፈርዖን** “Pharaoh’s men of power” Gen. 50, 4; **ቅዱሱ⁽¹⁾ : ለእግዚእ** “the Holy One of God” Mark 1, 24. Allied to the Possessive relation is *the relation of the Part to the Whole*, as in **ሠናይቱ⁽¹⁾ : ለሰብእ** “the best part (‘the best’) of men” Hen. 20, 5; **ቀዳሜ : ወልድዩ** “the first of my children” Gen. 49, 3; and this relation then serves to express the Superlative (§ 187). In the same sense there may be subordinated to a Noun the same Noun in the Genitive, in order to raise the idea concerned to its very highest degree, or to exhibit it in its totality: **ለዓለመ : ዓለም** “to eternity of eternity” (*or* ‘to eternities of eternities’, ‘*in secula seculorum*’) *i. e.* “for all eternity” Hen. 10, 12; so too **ትውልደ : ትውልድ** Hen. 10, 14; **እሳት : እሳት** “a sea of fire” (‘an immense fire’, literally ‘a fire of fire’) Hen. 14, 22⁽²⁾; **ዕመቀ : ዕመቅ** (‘depth of depth’) *βαθὺ βάθος* Eccles. 7, 24; **ከራሜ : ከራሚ** (‘old store’) Lev. 26, 10 &c. (b) But farther a Noun (b) Genitive of Limitation. in the Constr. State may in a different fashion be defined by a second Noun: as when, for instance, the first Noun expresses the general notion and is limited by the second, which indicates the particular case: **ሀገረ : ኢየሩሳሌም** “the city of Jerusalem”; **በዓለ : ፋሲካ** “the feast of Passover”; **ዕለት : ሰንበት** “the Sabbath-day”; **ዕፀ : በለስ** “fig-tree”; **ሐሳዌ : መሲሕ** “a pretender of a Messias”, “a false Christ” 1 John 2, 18; **ኅብስተ : ናኦት** “unleavened bread” Judges 6, 20. Co-ordination, it is true, may also be made use of for words which stand in this relation to one another (§ 189); but yet union by means of the Construct State is likewise of common occurrence. The latter method is even employed,—although to be sure but rarely,—to connect an Adjective with a Substantive. In fact the Substantive, by subordinating an Adjective to itself through the assumption of the Construct State, limits its own

(¹) [*Cf. supra* § 153 *sqq.* for DILLMANN’s view of the Constr. St. relation as illustrated in the attachment of Suff. Pron. to the Noun.—TR.]

(²) [FLEMMING reads only **እሳት**, not **እሳት : እሳት** in this passage. TR.]

general notion by a particular determination of species. In meaning, however, a Word-group which is connected in this way, differs from one which is connected by mere co-ordination,—just as in German, *Grosskönig* differs in meaning from *grosser König*. Thus we read: **ሥርወ : ሕፋም** (“sinew of the forbidden”) “sinew forbidden” Gen. 32, 26, 33; **ማየ : ዋዑም** “fresh water” Lev. 14, 50—52; Numb. 5, 17; Deut. 8, 15; **ሀገረ : ነኪር** “foreign city” Judges 19, 12; **አማልክተ : ነኪር** “strange gods” Gen. 35, 2; Josh. 24, 14, 23; **ገብረ : ዕብራዊ** “Hebrew servant” Gen. 39, 14 (F); **አባ : አረጋዊ** “old father” Gen. 44, 20 (FH); **አማልክተ : ባዕድ** “other gods”, “secondary gods” Josh. 23, 16 (as contrasted with Josh. 24, 2, 16, 20, where we have **ባዕድ : አማልክተ**); Lev. 13, 37; **ምድረ : ነኪር** *Chrest.* p. 11, l. 23 sq.; **ቃለ : መዐርጊር** *ibid.* p. 13, line 14⁽¹⁾; [for a number of other instances v. *Kebrā Nag.*, ‘*Introd.*’ p. XVIII.]. The invariable mode of connecting the Possessives **ዚ.አየ** &c. by means of the Construct State of the preceding word belongs properly also to this section (§ 150, b). (c) Again, the dependent word may denote the Material or Origin of the first Noun, or some property attaching to it, and so this Genitive relation is especially employed to replace Descriptive words, *i. e.* Adjectives, Participles &c., which may be wanting: **ታቦተ : ዕዕ** “an ark of wood” (‘wooden’); **ሰይፈ : እሳት** “a fiery sword” Gen. 3, 24; **ብእሴ : ሐቅል** *ἄνθρῳπος ἄγροικος* Gen. 16, 12; **ቂጽለ : ዘይት** “olive-leaf” Gen. 8, 11; **ነፍሰ : ሕይወት** “a living soul” Gen. 9, 12; **ዕደወ : ስም** “men of renown” Gen. 6, 4; **ደቂቀ : ጎይል** “vigorous young men” Judges 18, 2; **ዕፀወ : መዐዛ** “odoriferous trees” Gen. 24, 3; **ነገረ : ባክ** “an idle word” Gen. 49, 4. And in particular, to indicate Adjectives, or other conceptional words that are wanting, the words **ባዕል** “lord, or master” and **ወልድ** ⁽²⁾ “son” are made use of,—the former in certain combinations, such as **ባዕለ : ጸጋ** “generous” (*lit.* ‘master of gifts’); **ባዕለ : መጽሐፍ** “skilled in writing”; **ባዕለ : ዕዳ** “a creditor”, and the latter as an expression for “old” in data of age, as **ወልድ : ፻ወ፲ ዓመት**

(1) BEZOLD, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Keilschriftf.*’ II, p. 316, thinks he has found something similar in Assyrian; [v. also FLEISCHER, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Ass.*’ I, p. 428 sq. DELITZSCH, ‘*Assyr. Gramm.*’, § 122, 2]; v. on the other hand LEHMANN, *Zeitschr. f. Keilschriftf.* II, p. 437.

(2) Yet perhaps only in passages where the Ground-text in Hebr. and Greek has this form of expression [or where **ባዕል** is a translation of the Arabic **صاحب** or **ذو**].

"110 years old" (*lit.* "son of 110 years") Judges 2, 8. (d) Finally, ^{(d) Genitive indicating other Determinations of Condition.} the Construct State expresses also many other conceivable determinations of condition, as in **ዕፀወ : መሥዋዕት** "wood for the sacrifice" ("sacrificial wood") Gen. 22, 6; and particularly, when the Noun in the Constr. State is nearly related in force to the Verb. Of this class are Participles and Verbal Adjectives, which, on taking the Constr. St., may be more exactly specified in one fashion or other, by means of Nouns following, *e. g.*: **ዕቡዩ : ዐይን** "of haughty countenance" (*lit.* 'arrogant of eye'); **ሥሡዐ : ልብ** "of insatiable heart" Ps. 100, 7; **ርቱዐ : ሃይማኖት** ('sound in the faith') ὁρθό-δοξος; **ምሉአ : ጸጋ** "full of grace"; **ርሐቀ : መዐት** "far from anger" ('slow to anger') Hen. 40, 9; **እኅዝ : ጋኔን** "possessed of the devil" Mark 3, 11; **ርጉዝ : ገቦ** "pierced in the side"; **ይቡሳነ : ልብ** "hard-hearted"; **ሠናዩ : መዊእ** "victorious", "triumphant"; **ቅሩብዩ** "near me" Gen. 45, 10; **ሕያዋነ : ሕይወት : ዘለዓለም** "living an everlasting life" Hen. 15, 6; **ገባርያነ : ሰላም** "peace-makers" Matt. 5, 9⁽¹⁾. To this class belong, farther, those Infinitives and conceptional words of an Infinitive character, which when in the Constr. St. may subordinate to themselves any Object that is governed in the Accusative by their respective verbs: **ፍጻሃ : ለኩሉ : እኳት** "requital for all the evil" Gen. 50, 15; **ሥልጣነ : ኩሉ** "dominion over all" Hen. 9, 5; **ቀጥለ : ነፍስ** "to take a life" (*lit.* 'to kill a soul') Matt. 19, 18; **አክብሮ : አብ : ወእም** "to honour father and mother" Matt. 19, 19; **በዊአ : ሀገር** "to enter into the city" Mark 1, 45; **በጸሐ : እፍራታ** "to arrive at Ephrath" Gen. 35, 16; **ከዊነ : በኩር** "the being first-born" Gen. 25, 32 *sq.*; **ወሪደ : ግብጽ** "to go down into Egypt" Gen. 46, 3; **መኑ : ይክል : ነገረ : ምሕረቱ** Sir. 18, 5.

An entire sentence may also supply the place of the dependent Noun. In particular, words conveying Notions of Time are frequently connected, in the Constr. St., with an entire sentence, and constitute thus an analogue to those prepositions, which are also used as conjunctions (*v.* § 170). For example: **በሳኒተ : በልዑ** "on the second day—(of the—'they have eaten')— after they had eaten" Josh. 5, 12; **ጊዜ : ይገውሕ : ጽባሕ** "about the time when the

⁽¹⁾ The addition of a Suffix to the Noun determining the Constr. St. is worthy of notice: thus "fair of face" is not only rendered by **ላሕዩ : ገጽ**, but also by **ላሕዩ : ገጹ**, *e. g.* in *Chrest.* p. 38, line 2.

day was dawning" ("at daybreak") Josh. 6, 15; **ጊዜ : የዐርብ : ፀሓይ** "at the time when the sun was setting" Mark 1, 32; **ዕለተ : ተወልዶ : ፈርዖን** "Pharaoh's birthday" Gen. 40, 20; **በዕለተ : አንድግዎ : ጥበ** "on the day that they weaned him" Gen. 21, 8.

Rules
observed in
the Use of
the Constr.
St. Relation.

§ 185. Now when words are in this way bound in one group, by means of the Constr. St., it is obvious (§ 144) that the dependent word must come immediately after the governing one, seeing that a portion of the force of the entire relation lies precisely in the immediate connection of the two words. No other word then can be inserted between any two that stand in the Constr. St.-relation⁽¹⁾. Accordingly, if the governing word adopts an additional determination, *e. g.* an Adjective, this must come before or after the entire group: **ዐቢይ : ዐጰደ : ወይን** or **ዐጰደ : ወይን : ዐቢይ**, but not **ዐጰደ : ዐቢይ : ወይን** "a large vineyard"; or, if the governing word is associated with a Possessive which has to be expressed by a Suffix, the Suffix is not attached to the Construct State⁽²⁾, like **ንዋየክ : ሐቅል**, but either it is put at the end of the whole group, as in **ንዋየ : ሐቅልክ** "thy field-apparatus" ('weapons') Gen. 27, 3; **መሥዋዕተ : መድኅኒትክሙ** "your thank-offering" Josh. 22, 27; **ቤተ : አቡክ** "thy father's house" Gen. 12, 1; **ዐጽመ : ገላው** "his ('bone of the side') rib" Gen. 2, 22; **ክልኤሆሙ : ሊቀ : ኅዕዋኒሁ** "his two chief eunuchs" Gen. 40, 2, or the Constr. St.-Relation is replaced by another mode of denoting the Genitive (*v. infra*, § 186). Farther, it is unusual for one and the same Genitive to be dependent upon two words, in such manner that both should be set in the Constr. St., and the dependent word attached only to the latter of the two.

(¹) [Short enclitic words, however, may sometimes be found between a Constr. St. and the word which it governs (*v. PRAETORIUS*, '*Aethiop. Gr.*', p. 115, where other exceptional appearances are also noticed). R. H. CHARLES, '*Book of Jubilees*', 1895, *Introd.*, finds fault with DILLMANN for omitting to note that demonstrative prons., the pronominal adj. **ኹሉ** and numerals, occasionally intervene between the Constr. St. and its dependent noun. But in some of these instances, if not in all, DILLMANN would probably have had respect to the Substantive-genesis of **ኹሉ** &c., and have regarded these words in such circumstances as being themselves governed directly by the immediately preceding Constr. St. TR.]

(²) And yet we read in Numb. 18, 31: **ግብረክሙ : ደብተራ : ዘመርጡል** "your reward for service in the tabernacle of testimony", for which other MSS. have **ግብርክሙ : ዘደብተራ : ዘመርጡል**.

“To a tribe and a family in Israel”—is not usually rendered: **ለነገድ : ወሐሐበ : እስራኤል**, but the dependent word must either be put after each of the words in the Constr. St., like **ለነገድ : እስራኤል : ወሐሐበ : እስራኤል**; or, if this arrangement seem too prolix, the word must be represented after the second of the pair by a Pron. suff. [as it is in Arabic]:—**ለነገድ : እስራኤል : ወሐሐበ**; or, lastly, the first governing word must stand in the Absolute State: **ለነገድ : ወሐሐበ : እስራኤል** Judges 18, 19; **እምድረ : ኅልቀት : ወተፍጻሜተ : ደይን** G. Ad. 39, 23; **ብቲክ : ወመቲረ : አሕማላት** *M. Berh.* f. 9 b. Still, exceptions to this rule are met with: v. *Chrest.* p. XV [and BEZOLD, ‘*Zeitschr. f. Keilschriftf.*’ II, p. 355, N. 1]⁽¹⁾. Two Genitives, however, may be dependent on one and the same Constr. St., at least if they are both of the same class, and have the same relation to the governing word, *e. g.* **አድባረ : ዛቡሎን : ወንፍታሌም** “the mountains of Zebulon and Naphthali” Matt. 4, 13; **አፍራስ : ሶዶም : ወጎሞር** Gen. 14, 11; **አምላክ : ሰማይ : ወምድር** Gen. 24, 7; **ተክለ : ጽድቅ : ወርትዕ** Hen. 10, 16. In the very same way it is sufficient to set a Preposition once only, before a whole series of words joined together by “and”, as *e. g.* in Gen. 13, 14; but it may also be repeated every time, as in Gen. 12, 1; 13, 2; 27, 16; 47, 17; and the repetition is absolutely necessary, if the word in the Genitive just preceding has been expressed by means of a Suffix, *e. g.* **ለከ : ወለዘርእከ** “to thee and to thy seed” Gen. 24, 7⁽²⁾.

A word, dependent on a Constr. St., may itself again stand in the Constr. St., to govern another word, *e. g.* **ተድባበ : ቤተ : መቅደስ** “the pinnacle of the temple” (*lit.* ‘of the house of the Sanctuary’) Matt. 4, 5; **ስመ : አቡክ** “the name of thy father” (*i. e.*, ‘the name of the father of thee’); and thus, by farther extension, a longer concatenation of Nouns may be produced, bound together by the Constr. St.: **መጽሐፈ : ሚጦተ : ብርሃናተ : ሰማይ** Hen. 72, 1;

⁽¹⁾ Cf. also D. H. MÜLLER, ZDMG XXIX, p. 117 *sqq.* on the Construct State in Minao-Sabaic.

⁽²⁾ LUDOLF correctly asserts, that in Poetry the Constr. St. may even be put after the word dependent upon it: v.,—besides **እምወሰን : ወሰነ**, which he adduces as an example,—**ስብሐተ : መላእክት : ለሐዋጼ** *Chrest.* p. 36, line 9; **ገድልኪ : ወትሩፋተ** *ibid.* p. 147, Str. 3, l. 3; and cf. *ibid.* p. XVI.

መላእክተ : ነገድ : አብያተ : አበዊሆሙ : ለሕዝብ Josh. 21, 1; **ዕብዩ : ክብረ : ስብሐተ : ቅድሳቲክ** Ps. 144, 5⁽¹⁾.

When a word-group,—held together by the Constr. St., and answering to our Compounds in expressing only one single idea,—has to enter upon the plural, sometimes the one component is put in the plural, sometimes the other, and sometimes both⁽²⁾:—**አርዌ : ምድር** ('beast of the earth') "serpent", forms the plural **አራዊተ : ምድር ; ዐጽመ : ገቦ** "rib" ('bone of the side') either **ዐጽመ : ገበዋት** (*Org.*) or **አዕጽምተ : ገቦ ; ቤተ : ክርስቲያን** "Church", **አብያተ : ክርስቲያን** or **ቤተ : ክርስቲያናት** or **አብያተ : ክርስቲያናት ; አበ : ምኒት** "abbot", **አበ : ምኒታት** or **አበወ : ምኒታት ; ሐሳውያነ : መሲሕ** "false Christs" Matt. 24, 24; **ሐሳውያነ : ነቢያት** "false prophets" Matt. 24, 11; **ውሉደ : ዘማ** "children of harlots" (*i. e.* of different **ዘማ**) Hen. 10, 9 &c.

If the dependent word is to be thought of in our languages as furnished with the Definite Article, this determination may be expressed, in accordance with § 172, *c*, by a Suffix attached in advance to the Constr. St. and followed by **ለ**, *e. g.* **ምሕረቱ : ለእግዚአብሔር** "the mercy of God"; **ነገሮ : ለኢየሱስ** "the talk about Jesus" (*acc.*) Matt. 14, 1; **ከሠታ : ለጠፈራ : ለታቦት** "he removed the covering of the ark" Gen. 8, 13. In this case the dependent word which is introduced by **ለ** may even stand before the governing word, or be separated from it by several other words. And when several Genitives are strung together, the **ለ** may according to circumstances be repeated before every one, or on the other hand, when no misunderstanding can arise, it may be left out on the second occasion, as *e. g.* in Gen. 14, 1. Now and then also, when the governing word assumes in addition a secondary determination, of an adjective form, Ethiopic goes so far in the freedom of its word-arrangement that the Suffix, referring to the Genitive, is appended to the Adjective instead of to the Substantive: **ዝንቱ : ዳግሙ : ለእግዚእ : ኢየሱስ : ዘገብረ : ተአምረ** "*hoc est alterum domini Jesu, quod fecit miraculum*" John 4, 54.

In Ethiopic the Definite Article of other languages is frequently expressed (*v.* § 172, *a*) by a Suff. Pron. appended to the

⁽¹⁾ A remarkable arrangement is given in **ቃለ : ጸላእተ : ብካይ** (for **ቃለ : ብካይ : ጸላእት**) Sap. 18, 10 A.

⁽²⁾ Cf. HOFFMANN, 'Gr. Syr.' p. 254. [Cf. farther NÖLDEKE, 'Syr. Gr.' (English Ed.), p. 85 sq. TR.]

word which is to be determined, that is to say, by a Genitive relation. All Adjectives, in particular, when they are employed rather in the sense of Substantives, *i. e.* when they indicate a definite species of some general class of beings or objects which has been previously mentioned,—must be supplemented by a Suffix referring to the Substantive already named; and the Suffix is to be understood here in a partitive sense, *e. g.*: “the men of the city surrounded the house, both old and young” **ዐቢዮሙ : ወንኡሶሙ** Gen. 19, 4, 11; “and to the second (son) he said” **ወለካልኡኒ : ይቤ** (*i. e.* “to the second of it”, namely ‘of the family *or* pair of sons’) Matt. 21, 30⁽¹⁾; and the same usage prevails in the case of Numeral Adjectives (§ 191). But in other cases also, whenever a Noun,—standing in a partitive or possessive relation to another Noun previously mentioned,—is newly introduced into the sentence, the accuracy and nicety of the language demand that this reference be indicated by a Suffix, *e. g.* “he fled on foot” **ጉዩ : በእግሩ** (‘with *or* on his feet’) Judges 4, 15. In particular, certain conceptions, which are incomplete when they stand alone and which are dependent for their completion upon others, such as words specifying Place, Time, Measure, Number and Sort, must almost invariably be completed by another conception which they govern by means of the Construct St.; and when this latter conception is not directly combined with them, they assume a Suffix referring to it, *e. g.*: **ዑዳ : ለምድር : ውስተ : ኑታ : ወርሕባ** “walk through the land in the length of it and breadth of it” Gen. 13, 17; “until it can no longer be numbered **እምነ : ብዝሁ** for multitude” (*lit.* ‘for its multitude’) Gen. 16, 10; “a child, which she had born **በርሥ አቲሃ** in her old age” Gen. 21, 7; v. also Gen. 37, 3; “I am small in number” **ዑሐድ : አነ : በኑልቀዮ** (*lit.* ‘in my number’) Gen. 34, 30; “until the end” **እስከ : ተፍጻሜቱ** Gen. 2, 2⁽²⁾; “such is not the lawful course” **ኢኮነ : ከማሁ : ሕጉ** Gen. 34, 7; “the place was called in ancient time,—so-and-so” **ትካቲሁ** (‘in the old time of it’) Gen. 28, 19, (but also **ትካት** Judges 1, 10, 11); “on the second day” **በላኒታ**; “(it is evening), and the time of it (*i. e.* for supper) has passed by”

(1) Cf. DILLMANN'S ‘Lex.’ col. 821.

(2) [It is noteworthy that this locution **እስከ : ተፍጻሜቱ** serves to

express our *etc.*, corresponding to the Arabic **إلى آخره**, *e. g.* *Lit.* (ed. BEZOLD in C. A. SWAINSON'S ‘Greek Liturgies’) p. 383, *paen.*]

ወሰዓቱኒ ፡ ገለፈ Matt. 14, 15; “the veil was rent in twain from the top to the bottom” **እምላሳሉ ፡ እስከ ፡ ታሕቱ** (*lit.* ‘from the top of it to the bottom of it’) Matt. 27, 51; *cf.* Gen. 35, 8 &c. Accordingly certain words of this sort are constantly furnished with a suffix, v. §§ 157, 2; 163, 2; 191.

§ 186. 2. The Genitive relation, however, may also be expressed, in accordance with § 145, *b*, as follows.

2. Peri-
phrastic
Indication
of the
Genitive:—
(a) By means

of **H**, in use and significance, as the subordination effected by the **እንተ, እሳ**. Constr. St.; but it is essentially distinguished from it, as regards the manner of its employment, by the circumstance that with it the words are not tied down to any fixed position. On the contrary the Genitive which is constituted by **H** answers completely to the Genitive case of other languages; and its position with respect to the word on which it depends is just as free as that of any Genitive in Indo-European tongues. In fact the effort to attain freedom in the position of words and in the structure of the Sentence appears to be the real procuring cause of the development in Ethiopic of this peculiar denotation of the Genitive. It is applied with especial frequency in the following cases.

(α) When the governing word is a Proper name, which does not admit of a Constr. St., *e. g.* **ቤተ ፡ ልሔም ፡ ዘይሁዳ** “Bethlehem of Judah” Matt. 2, 5; or when it cannot take any special form in the Constr. St., on account of its vowel-ending, *e. g.* **ምሳሌ ፡ ዘክር ዳደ ፡ ገራህት** “the parable of the tares of the field” Matt. 13, 36; or when it stands at the same time in the Accusative, and when accordingly the Construct State cannot be discriminated from the Absolute State, *e. g.* **ቀተለ ፡ ዡሎ ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ ዘቤተ ፡ ልሔም** Matt. 2, 16.

(β) To avoid too long a chain of Nouns linked together by the Constr. St., or when the governing word has other determinations associated with it, from which it must not be separated, *e. g.* **ትእዛዝ ፡ ቅዳማዊ ፡ ዘብርሃናት** “the first ordinance of the lights” Hen. 72, 2; **በዕለት ፡ ዐባይ ፡ እንተ ፡ ዡነኔ** “in the great day of judgment” Hen. 10, 6; particularly when the governing word has already another Genitive depending upon it: **ዝውእቱ ፡ ደምየ ፡ ዘሐዲስ ፡ ሥርዐት** “this is my blood of the New Testament” Matt. 26, 28; **ኮራየ ፡ እንተ ፡ ብሩር** “my silver cup” Gen. 44, 2; **ምሕዋር ፡ ዘአውራጉ**

“his monthly course” Hen. 74,1; **አልባሲ፡፡ዘመበለታ** “her widow’s-garments” (*lit.* ‘her garments of her widowhood’) Gen. 38,14; **ኩሎ፡ከብርዩ፡ዘብሔረ፡፡ግብጽ** “all my glory in the land of Egypt” Gen. 45,13; 31,7; **ምሥዋዖ፡ለበዓል፡ዘአቡከ** “the altar of Baal belonging to thy father” Judges 6,25; **ኀበ፡ዕፀ፡በለን፡እንተ፡ላሕ** “by the oak of lamentation” Gen. 35,8; **ኮለ፡ሐቅል፡ዘወልድኪ** “thy son’s mandrakes” Gen. 30,14.

(γ) Very frequently, also,—to avoid the repetition of the governing word, which in the Construct State relation would be indispensable, or at least desirable. If in fact several Genitives have to depend upon one and the same word, that word may no doubt be set down in the Constr. St. only once, and yet subordinate to itself more Genitives than one (v. § 185); but it is more usual in such a case to prefix **ዘ** to the second Genitive as well as to the third, and so on, the continuation of the Genitive relation being thereby denoted more clearly, *e. g.* **መዛግብተ፡፡ፀሐይ፡ወዘወርሃ** “the treasures of the sun and (those) of the moon” Hen. 41,5; **አዕጸዳተ፡ወይን፡ወዘዘይት** “vineyards and oliveyards” Judges 15,5; or the Construct State relation may even be given up altogether, *e. g.* **ኖሎት፡ዘሎጥ፡ወዘአብራም** “the herdsmen of Lot and of Abram” Gen. 13,7; **አብሓኑ፡ዘአባግዕ፡ወዘአጣሊ** “rams and he-goats” (*lit.* ‘males of the sheep and of the goats’) Gen. 31,10. The possibility of denoting the Genitive in this way is of special value in those cases in which the Genitive is separated, in any fashion, rather far from its governing Noun, *e. g.* **ወነሥኦ፡ሎቱ፡በትረ፡ዘልብን፡ሐመልሚሊ፡ወዘከርካዕ፡ዐቢያ** “and he took to him a green rod of poplar and a great rod of the almond-tree” Gen. 30,37; **ምሀርካ፡ዘይሄይስ፡እምዘ፡አኅዊክ** “a spoil which is better than thy brethren’s” Gen. 48,22 (—in these two instances other tongues would have had to repeat **በትረ** and **ምሀርካ**); or in those cases in which the Genitive supplies the place of a Predicate: **ወይከውኑ፡ኩሎሙ፡ዘአምላክ** *καὶ ἔσονται πάντες τοῦ Θεοῦ* Hen. 1,8; **ወራእዩ፡ከመ፡ዘመብረቅ** (= **ከመ፡ራእዩ፡መብረቅ**) “and his appearance was as that of a blaze of lightning” (“his countenance was like lightning”, *E. V.*) Matt. 28,3; **አንተሙ፡ዘከርስቶስ፡ወከርስቶስኒ፡ዘእግዚአብሔር** “ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s” 1 Cor. 3,23. This **ዘ** serves the purpose even of rendering the Greek *τὸ* when followed by a Genitive: **አኮ፡ከመ፡ዘበለስ፡ዘትገብሩ** “not merely would ye be able to accomplish *τὸ*

ἡς οὐκ ἔστι” Matt. 21, 21; ሀቡ : ዘነጋሢ : ለነጋሢ “render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s” Matt. 22, 21; ኢትሔሊ : ዘእግዚአብሔር : ዘእንበለ : ዘሰብእ “thou considerest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men” Matt. 16, 23.

(d) As, according to this representation, **H** expresses also the idea of “*the or those of*”⁽¹⁾, it is very often used in phrases which stand for Descriptive Words that are wanting, or Relative Adjectives and Derivatives of a personal nature, *e. g.* ዘጸርቅ “Raca! (‘ragged one’)” Matt. 5, 22; ዘመንፈስ “spiritual”; ዘወርቅ “golden”; ዘማእከል “middle” (*adj.*) Judges 16, 29; ዘውቅሮ “dug or hewn out” Deut. 6, 11; ዘጋኔን “possessed” or “a possessed person” Matt. 9, 32; [*cf.* also እንተ : ውስጥ : ዐይነ “our inner eye” *Chrest.* p. 49 *ult.*]; እለ : አጋንንት “those possessed with devils” Matt. 4, 24; 8, 16; ዘለምጽ “a leper” Matt. 8, 2; እለ : ለምጽ “lepers” Matt. 10, 8; እለ : ዐመፃ “unjust persons” Hen. 95, 7⁽²⁾; እለ : ክርስቶስ “Christ’s people” Mark 9, 41; ዘሕብር “speckled” Gen. 31, 8; ዘሕብረ : ጸዕፃ “spotted with white” Gen. 30, 40; ዘሕብረ : ሐመድ “ash-coloured” Gen. 30, 39; ዘጸጉረ : ገመል “of camel’s hair” Mark 1, 6; ዘበረድ “of snow” Matt. 28, 3⁽³⁾. The Collectives መንፈስ “soul”, “spirit” and ሥጋ “flesh”, if they are employed in the sense of “living beings” (ሠጃጃ, ከነ) and “mortal beings” (ገጃጃ), never become Personal words till **H** has been prefixed, *e. g.*: ነሉ : ዘመንፈስ Gen. 7, 22; ዘሥጋ Gen. 6, 12, 17; 7, 21; Matt. 24, 22; also ዘደም John 1, 13 &c.

This particle **H** besides is used readily to bring Demonstrative, Interrogative and Relative Pronouns conveniently into the Genitive. On rare occasions it stands with words of *separation* in the sense of an Ablative, *e. g.* ወደፈልጦሙ : ዘዘ : ዚአሆሙ “he will separate them from one another” Matt. 25, 32 (§ 159, *g*).

(b) Much less frequently is the preposition **ለ**,—which expresses reference in a general way—, employed to denote the Genitive relation. It is used for the most part, when the Genitive may

(1) Like the Arabic **لـ**, followed by the Genitive.

(2) [For these two words FLEMMING’S reading substitutes በዐመፃ. *TR.*]

(3) Many Ethiopic Proper names are also formed in the same way: ዘሥላሴ, ዘማርያም &c. [*Cf.* NÖLDEKE, ‘*Beitr. z. sem. Sprachw.*’, p. 104]. In the names of Feasts, however, this **H** is often left out: በሚካኤል for በዘሚካኤል “on Michael’s (day)”.

also be conceived of as a Dative, *e. g.* in **ከመ : ትኩኑ : ውሉደ :**
ለአቡክሙ “that ye may be children of your Father” Matt. 5, 45;
ይከውና : አሐደ : መርዒት : ለጆኖላዊ “they shall be one flock of
 one shepherd” John 10, 16; **አንትሙ : ውእቱ : ዴው : ለምድር** “ye
 are the salt of the earth” Matt. 5, 13; **ወዮሴፍስ : መልአክ : ውእቱ :**
ለብሔረ : ግብጽ Gen. 42, 6; **እግዚእ : ለከሉ** “lord of all” Gen. 45, 8;
 39, 1; 40, 1; Sap. 14, 1 A; 14, 15;—or when the Genitive expres-
 ses merely a *reference* to some thing or person: **ትእምርት : ለያዕ**
ቆብ “the sign of Jacob” (‘which points to him’) Gen. 30, 42; **ኢይ**
ትረከብ : ለሙ : አሰር “no trace of them is found” Hen. 48, 9
 (where **ለሙ** is chosen instead of **አሰርሙ** in order that **አሰር**
 might remain indefinite); **ዕጸቡ : ለኩነኔ** “the severity of the judg-
 ment” Hen. 68, 2;—or to indicate the originating cause: **መፀዛ :**
ለስኒን : ወከርቤ Hen. 29, 2⁽¹⁾; **ሎቱ : መፀዛ** “the odour of it”
 Hen. 25, 6;—or even to put in the Genitive a Pronoun, upon
 which the emphasis rests: **ወላቲኒ : ማይ : የሐውር** “and even its
 water is flowing” Hen. 26, 3⁽¹⁾. A peculiar use occurs of **ለ** after
እለ in the sense of “the (*pl.*) of” (*v. supra a, δ*): **ወአርዳኢሁ :**
ለዮሐንስ : ወእለሂ : ለፈሪሳውያን “and the disciples of John and
 also those of the Pharisees” Mark 2, 18. Similarly **ለ** is found
 besides in use to carry on the Genitive relation through farther
 members of a sentence, if the Genitive was expressed in the first
 member by means of a Suffix: **ልቦ : ወለዐበይቱሂ** “his heart and
 that of his great ones” Ex. 9, 35; 10, 1.

(*c*) To express the Genitive relation in a Partitive sense,
እምነ (§ 164, No. 3) is also employed, or the Preposition,—com-
 pounded with **እም**,—**እምውስተ**. Thus “one of them” is **አሐዱ :**
እምኔሆሙ ; “which of the two?” **መኑ : እምክልኤሆሙ ;** “one of
 us” **፩እምኔነ** Gen. 3, 22; Josh. 8, 37; and so, particularly, in the
 case of numerical data, *e. g.* Matt. 25, 2; 26, 47; 22, 28; **አመ : ኮነ :**
፯፻ወ፩መተ : እምሕይወቱ : ለኖሕ “in the six hundred-and-first
 year of Noah’s life” Gen. 8, 13;—also in combinations like **እለ :**
እምውስተ : ጸሐፍት “certain of the scribes” (‘some who were of
 the scribes’) Matt. 9, 3; **እሉ : ውእቶሙ : እምነ : ከዋክብት : እለ**
 “these are (those of) the stars which” &c. Hen. 21, 6.

(*c*) By
እምነ,
 to express
 the Partitive
 Genitive.

⁽¹⁾ [In Hen. 29, 2 FLEMMING reads **ስኒን** without the prep., and in
 Hen. 26, 3, **ባቲኒ** instead of **ላቲኒ**. TR.]

(b) *Subordination through the Accusative
or through Prepositions.*

(b) Sub-ordination through the Acc. or through Preps.:— § 187. These two kinds of Subordination are characteristic of the Verb, and they can properly occur in the department of Nouns, only when a Noun approximates the Verb in force and meaning.

1. Infinitives may govern a Noun in the *Accusative*. First of all, of course, the Gerund may do so; for, having already a Suffix bound up with it in the sense of Subject, it does not permit of being connected with its Object by means of the Constr. St., *e. g.* **ገዲሕው : ሐመረ : ወአባሆው** “leaving the ship and their father” (‘when they left the ship &c.’) Matt. 4, 22; **ወኪያው : ርእየ** “and seeing him” (‘and when he had seen him’) John 21, 21; **ሰፈሐ : እደሁ** “stretching forth his hand” Matt. 8, 3. Substantive-Infinitives for the most part, it is true, take their Object to themselves after the manner of Nouns, *i. e.* by means of the Constr. St. relation, *e. g.* Matt. 22, 29; 8, 12; Mark 2, 7; 3, 4; Gen. 8, 21; 11, 8 (*v. supra* § 184); but they may take it also in the Accusative, *e. g.* Deut. 5, 22; Matt. 10, 28; 7, 11; 27, 15; **ቅንዩትክ : ወምልክናክ : ኩሎ** Sap. 12, 16—(old version); and now and then too an abstract word, of Infinitive form, follows their lead in this proceeding, *e. g.* in **በክቱ : መንግሥተ : ሰማያት** “his entering into the kingdom of heaven” Matt. 19, 23. But Accusatives may be found in dependence on certain Adjectives even, and on Participial Descriptive-words, just as on a Verb, although upon the whole this is not of frequent occurrence. Active Participles, and words which signify the Agent, nearly always connect themselves with a Noun through the Constr. St. relation, *e. g.* **መፈውስ : ነፍስ** (not **መፈውስ : ነፍስ**) “a physician of souls”,—and have thus already become complete Nouns⁽¹⁾. On the other hand certain Adjectives, from Verbs which govern an Accusative, also take in their turn a Noun in the Accusative, particularly *Adjectives of Fullness and Want*: **ምሉአን : አዕጽምተ** “full of bones” Matt. 23, 27; **ምልእት : ሕምዘ** “full of poison” Jas. 3, 8; Gen. 14, 10; **ጽዑን : አፈዋተ** “laden with spices” Gen. 37, 25; even **እጉዝ** *ἐχόμενος* may be connected in this way: **እጉዝን : መሣግረ : ጎፂን** “holding iron

(1) V. however Sir. 43, 33: **እስመ : ኩሎ : እግዚአብሔር : ገባራ**.

fetters” Hen. 56, 1⁽¹⁾. Farther, any attributive word may take to itself an Adverbial accusative (§ 174): **ሠናይት : ይእቲ : ገጸ** “she is fair of face” Gen. 26, 7; **ሥቡሐን : ሥጋሆሙ** “fat in their flesh” Gen. 41, 2; and in the same way any Adverb (in the Accusative) may be attached to it, whether it precedes or follows: **ባዕል : ፈድፋድ** “exceedingly rich” Gen. 13, 2; **እምነ : ርሐቅ : ብሔር : ጥቀ** “from a very far country” Josh. 9, 7 &c.

2. Conceptional and Descriptive words, nearly allied to the Verb, are more frequently supplemented or specifically determined by a Noun governed by an intervening *Preposition*. Thus we say: **በቀል : ለነፍሶሙ** “revenge for their life” Hen. 22, 11; **ስምዕ : በሐሰት** “false witness” Matt. 15, 19; **ላሕ : በእንተ : እሙ** “mourning for his mother” Gen. 24, 67; **በአት : እንተ : ስቀረተ : ሞርፍእ** “the going in through a needle’s eye” Matt. 19, 24; also **ውሉደ : ትጉሃን : እምሰብእ** “the children of the watchmen among men” (inasmuch as **ውሉደ** is originally a Passive Participle, § 136, 1) Hen. 10, 9; **ነሐኀ : ድቀት : በዲበ : ድቀት** “he has thrown me down with fall upon fall” Job 16, 14 &c. Of course these closer determinations are more usually annexed by means of the Relative pronoun. Besides, an Infinitive may at once take to itself any noun, with the help of the Preposition which its own verb governs; and it is even possible to have such combinations as **ወዘእንበለ : ተኀሐሶ : እደውሰ : በሊዕ : ኢያረከሶ : ለሰብእ** “but to eat without having washed the hands defileth not a man” Matt. 15, 20. Nouns may also be joined by means of Prepositions to Adjectives and Participle-like words, just as well as to any verb⁽²⁾; and they are often joined to Passive Participles by means of **በ** “with”, as in **ኅኑጽ : በልሳነ : እሳት** “built with flames (‘tongues’) of fire” Hen. 14, 15⁽³⁾; **ጽጉባን : በኩሉ : ጥበብ** “filled (*pl.*) with all wisdom” Rom. 15, 14; **ልቡጥ : በወርቅ** “overlaid with gold” Ex. 28, 20; **ንዙሃ : በደም** “sprinkled with blood” Rev. 19, 13; to other Participles and Adjectives (with intransitive conceptions) in conformity with the verb in each case, as in **ንጹሕ : እምነ** “clear of” Matt.

2. Concep-
tional and
Descriptive
Words,
supplemen-
ted by
Noun
governed
by inter-
vening
Preposition.

(¹) [FLEMMING reads here:—**ይእኅዙ : መቅሠፍተ : ወመሣግረ : ኀጺን**. TR.]

(²) In this case alternating partly with the connection which is described in § 184, (*d*).

(³) [Cf. FLEMMING’s reading: **ሕኑጽ : በልሳናተ : እሳት**. TR.]

27, 24; Gen. 24, 8; **ምሉእ : እምነ** “full of” Deut. 6, 11; **ዕሩቅ : እምነ** “empty of”; **ባዕል : እምነ** “rich in” Gen. 13, 2; **ካልእ : እምነ** “different from” Hen. 40, 2; **ውኩል : በ** or **ላዕለ** “relying upon”; **ዕሩይ : ምስለ** “equal to”; **ቅሩብ : ለ** “near (one)” Gen. 14, 13; or with **ኀበ** 23, 13; **ልጹቅ** with **ውስተ** or **ለመንገለ** “bordering upon”; **መጋቢ : ላዕለ** “steward of” Gen. 24, 2. Adjectives also, and even Substantives, may be supplemented by **ለ** with the Infinitive, for the purpose of giving a special direction to a general idea: **ሠናይ : ለበሊዕ : ወሠናይ : ለርእይ** “good to eat and fair to look upon” Gen. 2, 9; Hen. 24, 5; **ጽልመት : ለነጽሮ** “a darkness to be beheld” Hen. 22, 2; 21, 8; 24, 5.

3. Prepositions employed in intensifying and comparing Qualitative Conceptions.

3. In particular, Prepositions are also employed in intensifying and comparing Qualitative conceptions (v. § 179, 2); and in this process Intransitive Verbs, which express qualities, are equivalent to Descriptive Words, inasmuch as (v. § 202) periphrases, contrived by the Relative and a finite Verb, are, in the absence of participles and adjectives, used as Adjectives; or the Verb even is itself frequently set down, when an Adjective might have been expected to stand as Predicate. To express the degrees of comparison, of other languages, a simple Adjective or Verb is often quite sufficient in Ethiopic, if it is placed in an emphatic position, or if the class of objects, among which some one is specially distinguished, is farther specially mentioned and introduced by **በ**, **በውስተ** &c., *e. g.*: **ሕጹጽ : ይሰመይ : በመንግሥት** “he shall be called the least in the kingdom” Matt. 5, 19; **ኦይነ : ትእዛዝ : የዐቢ : በውስተ : ኦሪት** “which commandment is great (‘the greatest’) in the law?” Matt. 22, 36; **ኣነ : ንኡስ : በቤተ : ኣቡዮ** “I am the least of my family” Judges 6, 15; **ዘየዐቢ : ትእዛዛት** “the greater commandments” Matt. 23, 23; **ዘይሜኒ : ወይን** “the better wine” John 2, 10; Gen. 27, 15; and indeed some conceptional words in themselves include the degree of comparison, like **ኂሰ** “to be better”; **መብዝኅት** “the most” (‘the largest portion’) Ps. 77, 35; **መሠንይ** “the best” (‘the best part’) Numb. 31, 26.—When that, with which anything is compared, is expressly mentioned, it may be subordinated in the Accusative,—in the case of certain Verbs,—in accordance with § 176, 3, *d*, and in the Genitive (Partitive Genitive, § 184) with Adjectives, *e. g.*:—**ዐቢዮሙ** “the great one of them”, *i. e.* “their greatest one”; **ቅድስተ : ቅዱሳን** “the Holy of Holies”, *i. e.* “the most Holy (place)”. More usually, however, the Preposition

እምነ—which indicates ‘a part of a whole’ and also ‘preference’—is associated with the Verbs and Adjectives concerned, *e. g.*: **ጠቢብ : እምነ** “wiser than”; **ይንእስ : እም** “he is smaller than”; **ኅየሰ : እም** “he is better than”; **ጸድቀት : ትእማር : እምኔየ** “Tamar is more righteous than I” Gen. 38, 26; or **ቡርክት : እምአንስት** “more blessed than women”, *i. e.* “the most blessed one of women” Luke 1, 28. This phraseology for purposes of comparison may be used also with transitive Verbs, in which case **እምነ** means “more than”: **ያዕቆብ : ያፈቅሮ : ለዮሴፍ : እምነ : ነሎሙ : ደቂቁ** “Jacob loved Joseph (‘in preference to’) more than all his (other) sons” Gen. 37, 3. Even entire clauses may be compared with each other in this way (*v. infra*, § 204). **እምነ** farther is frequently preceded by an intensive Adverb, such as **ጥቀ** “very”; **ፈድፋድ** “exceedingly”, “much more”, *e. g.* **ይሥኅታ : ፈድፋድ : እምይእቲ : ሀገር** “it shall be much more tolerable for them (*lit.* ‘for it’, *i. e.* ‘the land &c.’) than for that city” Matt. 10, 15; Gen. 19, 9; 29, 30; Judges 2, 19; Matt. 18, 13; 11, 9; or,—when the particular conception has to be presented in its greatest intensity,—**ነሉ** is added after **እምነ**, *e. g.*: **ትጠብብ : እምነ : ነሉ : አራዊት** “it is more subtle than all the other beasts” Gen. 3, 1; Mark 4, 31; Hen. 8, 1; Gen. 34, 19: but yet **ነሉ** may be wanting, as in **ንስቲተ : እምነ : እኪት** “the least evil” *Chrest.* p. 45, line 5. **እምነ** is itself a Preposition, meaning “before”; and,—should it happen that a different Preposition is required to subordinate to the Verb the first member of the comparison, *i. e.* the word compared, this latter preposition is omitted after **እምነ** and before the second member of the comparison, *i. e.* before the word with which the first is compared: as in **ይትፌሣሕ : በእንቲአሃ : ፈድፋድ : እምተስዓ : ወተስዐቱ** “he rejoices over it more than over the ninety and nine” (*lit.* ‘he rejoices over it exceedingly, before the ninety and nine’) Matt. 18, 13; *cf.* also **እመ : ኢፈድፈድ : ጽድቅከሙ : ፈድፋድ : እምጸሐፍት** (where also **እምዘጸሐፍት** might have appeared, in accordance with § 186, *a, γ*) “unless your righteousness is greater than that of the scribes” Matt. 5, 20. Ethiopic, meanwhile, is so flexible that a Preposition of that nature may also appear after **እምነ**, *e. g.* in **ይኔይስ : ለከ : አሀብ : እምነ : ለካልእ : ብእሲ** “it is better that I give (her) to thee than to another man” Gen. 29, 19, where two clauses are compared together, and where **እምነ** is a short expression for **እምነ : ዘአሀብ**.

2. CO-ORDINATION OF NOUNS.

1. Co-ordination and Concord of Substantives and Demonstrative Pronouns, and of Substantives and Adjectives.

§ 188. In Co-ordination (Apposition) three stages may be distinguished, according to the degree of the closeness or looseness of the connection between the words.

1. *Adjectives*, as a rule, are joined to the Noun by Co-ordination. The same statement holds good for words resembling Adjectives, viz. *Demonstrative Pronouns* and *Numerals*, the Relative Pronoun also associating itself in a certain sense with them. Numerals and the Relative will be specially dealt with farther on (v. §§ 191 and 201 *sq.*). Demonstrative Pronouns are associated with the Noun exactly like Adjectives, except for the peculiarity, which they possess in contrast with the latter, of being usually placed before the Noun, as in **ይአቲ፡መንግሥት** Mark 3, 24; **ለውእቱ፡ጠፈር** Gen. 1, 8; **ውእተ፡ላህመ** 18, 8; *cf.* 50, 11; **ዝንቱ፡ብእሲ** 24, 65; **ኅኅተ፡ውእቱ፡ቤት** “the door of that house” Judges 19, 27; **ብርሃነ፡ዝኩ፡እሳት** “the light of that fire” Hen. 71, 2. When they are placed after the Noun, they are to be regarded rather as less closely co-ordinate, *e. g.* **ውስተ፡ሀገረ፡ኢያቡሴዎን፡ዛቲ** “into the city here of the Jebusites” Judges 19, 11. Several words also which were originally Substantives (Conceptional or Personal words), being used however as Adjectives, are classed with the Adjectives, as in **ላህም፡መግዝእ** “a fat ox” Judges 6, 28; **ትውልድ፡ዕሉት፡ወዘማ** “a perverse and adulterous race” Matt. 16, 4 (*ዘማ* is a noun, meaning “whore”); **ብእንተ፡ሐፍሦሙ፡ምልእ፡ሕፍን፡ሰገም** *ἐνεκεν ὁρακὸς κριθῶν* Ezek. 13, 19; other examples are found in Numb. 20, 17; 21, 22; Deut. 8, 15; 9, 1; farther, in particular, **ኩሉ** “all”, “every”; **ኅዳዋ** “a small quantity” and “few”; **ንስቲት** “a small thing” and “little” Jas. 3, 5; Gen. 19, 20; Judges 4, 19; Hen. 63, 6; **ሕቅ** “measure” and “moderate (in quantity)”, *e. g.* **ሕቀ፡ማየ** “a little water” Gen. 24, 17; finally, even **ምንትሂ**, **ምንትኒ** “anything”, and occasionally **ምንት** “what?” (v. § 198).

These words are set in apposition to the Noun; for the subordination of the Adjective to the Substantive, or of the Substantive to the Adjective, is upon the whole of rare occurrence, though it is certainly permissible, in accordance with § 184. The union by co-ordination is the closest possible; and in it the Adjective, as being the adventitious and less essential conception, must be regulated by the Noun, and must take Gender, Number and Case from the Noun.

The Rule of Concord in Case is observed without exception. Only, when one Noun governs another by means of the Construct State, the Adjective does not conform to such Constr. St. of the governing Noun, but is added rather as a Descriptive Word in co-ordination with the entire Word-group which is fashioned by the Constr. St. (v. § 185). If, however, the Noun stands in the Accusative, the Adjective must conform to it in that respect; and it is only in the case noted in § 143, *ad fin.*, that deviations are now and then met with, *e. g.*: **ገበር : ታቦተ : እንተ : ዕዕ : ወርብዕት** Gen. 6, 14.

On the other hand the remaining two Rules of Concord, which concern Gender and Number, although they hold good as general principles, suffer considerable limitation, to meet the peculiar fluctuations which are permitted in Ethiopic in the Gender and Number of Nouns. Since it is only actual Names of Persons that are invariably distinguished definitely as Masculine or Feminine (§ 130), while almost all other words may be regarded indifferently as Masculine or as Feminine,—the Adjective is of necessity Masculine only in the case of Names of Persons of the Masculine gender, and of necessity Feminine only in the case of like Names of Persons of the Feminine gender; while, in the case of all other Nouns, the Adjective is subject to the same fluctuations in gender that the usage of the language is exposed to as regards the gender of the Noun. Thus one says indeed **ምድር : ሠናይት** Mark 4, 8, but also **ምድር : ሠናይ**; **ዛተ : ምሳሌ** Mark 4, 13; **ውዴተ : እኪተ** Gen. 37, 2; **ዛተ : ሕይወተ : ዐባዩ** Judges 15, 18; **ወባዕድኒ : ነሉ : ፍትወት** Mark 4, 19; **ውእቱ : መስፈርት** Mark 4, 24; **ዐቢዩ : ፍርሀተ** Mark 4, 41; **ዝንቱ : ዕቅበት ; ዝንቱ : ፍርሀት** G. Ad. 38, 15 *sq.*; **ኅጢአተ : ዐቢዩ** Gen. 20, 9; **ርስዐት : ዐቢይ** Hen. 8, 2 ⁽¹⁾; **ትምህርት : ሐዲስ** Mark 1, 27; **ነሥአ : እባነ : ዐቢዩ**, and in the immediate context **ወአቀማ** Josh. 24, 26; [**ፀሐይ : ብሩህ : ወረደት** K. N. 25 b 6] &c.

Then, certainly, Personal Words in the Plural,—and particularly those Plurals of theirs, which have been formed by outer terminations—, are definitely either masculine or feminine; and, farther, official designations, which have been formed by means of *āt* (§ 133, *a*), are mostly regarded as being of the Masculine gender and in the Plural, and they are therefore generally associated with

(¹) [FLEMING here adopts the variant **ርስዓን : ዐቢይ**. TR.]

an Adjective in the Plural masculine, or feminine. But all other Plurals, particularly those of inner formation (Collective forms), may again be conceived of as compact collective notions, and therefore as Singulars, and either masculine or feminine,—following in fact the same fluctuation which prevails in the Gender of the Singular. In these cases a Plural may just as readily be associated with an Adjective in the Singular masculine or feminine, as with an Adjective in the Plural m. or f. (v. § 135). We meet with **ብዙኃን : ኃዋኣን** Mark 2, 15; **አሕዛብ : ብዙኃን** Mark 3, 20; **አድባር : ነዋኃን : ወአውግር : ነዋኃት** Hen. 1, 6; **ዐቢያተ : ወድሩካተ : ቃላተ** Hen. 5, 4; **ዕፀወ : ብዙኃን** Hen. 32, 3; **ካልኣት : አሕማር** Mark 4, 36;—but also with **ተአምራተ : ዐቢያነ : ወስቡሓነ** Hen. 36, 4; **እሙንቱ : ማያት** Hen. 67, 13; **አልባስ : ሠናይት** Gen. 24, 53; **ብዙኅ : አሕዛብ** Gen. 17, 4; **ውእተ : ቃላተ** Hen. 13, 10; **ዝቃት : ብሉይ** Matt. 9, 17; **ማያት : ብዙኅ** Ps. 92, 6; **ምግባራት : ሠናይ**. It may be given as a general observation, that any Plural, whatever be its form, may be joined to an Adjective in the Plural in that gender which belongs to the word in the Singular,—but also that any Plural, or even Plural of Plurals (§ 141) may be conceived of too as a Singular,—in which case it usually takes to itself the Adjective in the Singular and in the readiest gender, the Masculine, although it may also be in the Feminine. But, on the other hand, words which are Singular in form,—if they are either essentially the expression of collective notions, or even have merely a collective meaning in the particular passages concerned—, are joined to the Plural of the Adjective, and that too in the Gender which properly belongs to the individual components of the collective idea: **ብዙኃን : ሰብእ** Mark 4, 1; **ሕዝብ : ጽኑዓን** Gen. 14, 5; Deut. 9, 2; **ሰብሐት : ዐቢያት** “great splendours” (‘great magnificence’) Hen. 65, 12; **ለዘይመጽእ : ትውልድ : ርኅቃን** “for distant future generations” Hen. 1, 2⁽¹⁾; and even **ዐውያተ : ዐበይተ** Hen. 85, 6; *cf.* also **ዐበይት : ዝናም** with **ዐቢያ : ዝናመ** 1 Esr. 2, 49.—An Adjective which admits of an inner plural form, generally assumes it when the Noun, with which it is co-ordinated, has also the Collective form: **ዐናብርት : ዐበይት** Gen. 1, 21; **ተአምር : ዐበይት** Josh. 24, 17; **አሕዛብ : ዐበይት : ወጽኑዓን** Josh. 23, 9; **አበው :**

(¹) [Instead of the last two words here, FLEMMING reads **ርሕቅት**, the *Fem. Sing.* and does not, like DILLMANN, repeat **ትውልድ**. TR.]

ቀደምት Josh. 24, 2; and sometimes even when this condition is not present, *e. g.* **ብርሃኖች : ዐበይት** Gen. 1, 16.

ኩሉ is somewhat peculiar in its mode of junction with Nouns; *cf. supra* § 157, 2. It may stand alone, without being joined to any other Noun, with the meaning “everyone”, *e. g.* Hen. 7, 1; or “everything”, *e. g.* Hen. 1, 7; or “all (*pl.*)”, *e. g.* Gen. 16, 12; 45, 1; Hen. 1, 5. When it is associated with a Noun in the Fem. Sing., it should take the form **ኩላ**, *e. g.* **ኩላ : ዛተ : ምድረ** Gen. 26, 4; but, seeing that it is only loosely joined to the Noun, it often keeps its own readiest gender, even with a Feminine Noun, *e. g.* **ኩሉ : ወናይት : እንተ** Josh. 21, 43; **ኩሉ : ነፍስ : እንተ : ቦአት** Gen. 46, 27. With Nouns in the Plural, it may take the Plural form: **ኩሎሙ : ሊቃነ : ከሀናት** Matt. 2, 4; **ኩሎሙ : ሕሙማን** Mark 3, 10; **ኩሎን : አገማላት** Mark 4, 32; **ኩሎሙ : ኖሎት** Gen. 29, 3; but it may also remain in the Sing. Masc.: **ኩሉ : ተዓይን** Josh. 22, 16; **ኩሉ : ፍና ዊሁ** Josh. 22, 5; **ኩሉ : እለ** “all, who” Josh. 23, 14; **ኩሎ : ሕፃናተ** Matt. 2, 16; **ኩሎ : ዕፀወ** Gen. 2, 9; **ኩሉ : አዝርእት** Mark 4, 31:— and, as by its very nature it indicates plurality, the Noun which is associated with it does not altogether need to take the plural, but may sometimes be treated as a Collective: **ኩሎ : ቃለ : እግዚእ** “all the words (*Acc.*) of the Lord” Ex. 4, 28; **ኩሉ : ፀር** Josh. 21, 42 &c.

The *position of the Adjective* with reference to the principal Noun is perfectly free. In this respect Ethiopic ranks with the most unrestrained of Indo-European languages. It is observable, no doubt, that in uniform and level discourse the Adjective is oftener placed after the Substantive than before it⁽¹⁾. But whenever any special emphasis is laid upon the Adjective, or when the distribution of the other Word-groups, or the euphony of the whole sentence, renders it desirable, the Adjective may equally well precede the Noun. With difficulty even does the Constr. St. relation introduce a restriction, to the extent of preventing an Adjective, which belongs to a Noun in the Constr. St., from intervening between the Constr. St. and the Genitive which depends upon it,—although an Adjective, belonging to the Genitive, usually falls back in such a case. On the other hand, after any Preposition the

(¹) Only, **ጸናራ** “exterior” is nearly always put first: v. DILLMANN'S *Lex.*, col. 1295.

Adjective may be put before the Substantive; and Demonstrative Pronouns, as well as **ኑሉ**, almost always precede their Substantive, even when it is dependent upon a Construct State. So too the Adjective may be separated from its Substantive by several other words, as by Relative clauses, or by intervening Adverbial or other auxiliary qualifications, *e. g.* **ውስተ : ፩ እምእላንቱ : ግብ** “into a pit of these” (‘into one of these pits’) Gen. 37, 20, 22; 26, 1; **ወዘአሐቲ : ሐሊበ : በግዕ : ያጸግብ : ለጀስብእ** Is. 7, 22 (Old Vers.); or by Verbs &c., *e. g.* **ገራህተ : ልብዩ : ያንጽሐ : ርሱሐ** “*agrum cordis mei mudent immundum*” *Encomia Synaxarii*, Sen. 1 Enc. When more than one Adjective is connected with a Substantive, it is even more elegant and euphonious to separate them by the Substantive itself, or by other words, as in **ወብእሲ : ጸድቅ : ውእቱ : ወፍጹም** Gen. 6, 9; **ዐቢዩ : ሥቃዩ : ወእኩዩ** Gen. 12, 17; **ግሩም : ጽልመት : ወዐቢይ** Gen. 15, 12; **ሕዝበ : ዐቢዩ : ይከውን : አብ ርሃም : ወብዙኅ** Gen. 18, 18.

2. Substantives in Co-ordination with Substantives.

§ 189. 2. A Substantive may also attract other *Substantives*, in co-ordination, in order to attain thereby a more exact determination. No doubt, when two Substantives are related to one another as Genus and Species, the General and the Particular, recourse also may be had in many cases to the process of Subordination (§ 184); thus, for instance, **በውስተ : ሶዶም : ሀገር** (Gen. 18, 26) might also run **በውስተ : ሀገረ : ሶዶም**. But if the explanatory word is itself in turn determined by another,—as in **ዕዋል : እንለ : እድግት** Matt. 21, 5; **ብእሲ : ባዕለ : ቤት** Matt. 21, 33; **ባላቅ : ንጉሠ : ሶዶም** Gen. 14, 2, then co-ordination is the only course possible. As regards the position of the words, either the General or the Particular may be put first, according as it is desired to emphasise the one or the other:—**መልአክ : ዙጥኤል** Hen. 32, 2; **መልአክ : ቅዱስ : ሩፋኤል** Hen. 32, 6; **ውሉድ : ረዐይተ** “giant-sons” Hen. 15, 3; **ብእሲቱ : ርብቃ** Gen. 25, 21; **ዕቅብቱ : ርሔማ** Gen. 22, 24; or **ፀሐይ : ብርሃን** Hen. 72, 2; **ገሃነም : እሳት** Matt. 18, 9; **ዮሐንስ : መጥምቅ** Matt. 14, 2; **ዐውሎ : ዐቢይ : ነፋስ** Mark 4, 37; **ሄኖክ : ብእሲ : ጸድቅ : ወጸሐፌ : ጽድቅ** Hen. 15, 1. In this co-ordinate relation a Concrete even may appear alongside of an Abstract, as in **ብእሲ : ነጋዲት** “a man, a strangeness”, *i. e.* “a stranger” Judges 19, 17⁽¹⁾. If a Pronoun has to be interpreted in this way by

(1) Ex. 20, 8 is also to be explained by this relation of Apposition:

a Noun co-ordinated with it, the Pronoun stands first. Agreement in Case is called for also in the forms of co-ordination described here, as *e. g.* in **ብእሴ : ንጉሠ** Matt. 18, 23; but yet this relation is somewhat less binding here, than that which is described in § 188; and a Noun in apposition with an Accusative may therefore (*v.* § 143, *ad fin.*) remain without any mark of the Accusative, as in **አፍቅር : እግዚአብሔር : አምላክከ** Matt. 22, 37 (¹). When such a Substantive-group, formed by Apposition, is subordinated to a preposition, the preposition is not, as a rule, repeated before the word in apposition. When the group,—in accordance with § 172, *c*—, is introduced by a Suffix relating to it which is followed by **ለ**, then the **ለ** is usually set down once only, provided that in the group the more specific and particular word comes first, — as in **ወለዶ : ለሲዶን : በኩሩ** Gen. 10, 15; **ዶቤላ : ለሶራ : ብእሲቱ** Gen. 12, 11; but if the more general and less specific term precedes the other, **ለ** is often repeated before the word in apposition:—**ለእግዚእየ : ለአብርሃም** Gen. 24, 27, 36; the same thing occurs, if **ኩሉ** comes last, in loose co-ordination: **ለአግግሊሁ : ለኩሉሙ** Gen. 24, 20; **ለሰብአ : ኖሎት : ለኩሉሙ** Gen. 43, 32. Finally, when a Substantive or an Adjective is placed in apposition to a Suffix Pronoun, it is introduced by **ለ**, *e. g.* **ሊተ : ለጻድቅ** “to me, the righteous one”; **እምነ : እዲየ : ለባሕቲትየ** Judges 17, 3; Ps. 50, 5: but yet we have also **ወከያሁ : ባሕቲቶ** Matt. 4, 10.

3. Both the Subject and the Object (nearer or more remote) of a sentence may have new determinations added thereto, in quite loose and free co-ordination. These always admit of being resolved into full sentences, and properly are nothing but abbreviations of such sentences.

(a) When a word, appearing in this more remote form of apposition, is a simple *Substantive*, it may be placed in any position of the sentence, in the same Case as the noun to which it refers:—**መኑ : የዐርግ : ለኒ : ኀበ : ከናኔዎን : መልአክ** “who will go up for us as leader against the Canaanites?” Judges 1, 1; **የሀብ : ነፍሶ : ቤዛ : ብዙኃን** (“that) he might give his life a ransom for many” Matt. 20, 28; **ፈጠሮሙ : ተባዕተ : ወአንስተ** “he created them, male and female” Gen. 5, 2; 23, 16; 38, 18. When the word

3. Apposition-forms in the case of the Subject or the Object of a Sentence:—
(a) When the Word in Apposition is a Simple Substantiv

ተከከር : ዕለተ : ሰንበት : አጽድቆታ “remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy”—, **አጽድቆታ** being an amending Apposition to **ዕለተ**.

(¹) [—if this is not an old form of the Acc.; *cf.* *Kebra Nag.* p. XVI sq.].

in apposition refers to the Subject, and admits of being amplified by such a form as “so that he (or it) may be *this* or *that*”,—then it may even take the Accusative, in accordance with § 177, 5: መኑ : የዐርግ : ለነ : መስፍነ “who shall go up for us as leader?” Judges 20, 18; ይቀርቡ : ለቅሥተ : ጎጠ.አቶሙ : ፍሩሃነ ἐλεύσονται ἐν συλλογισμῷ ἁμαρτημάτων αὐτῶν δειλοί Sap. 4, 20; [ወእንዘ : ትነ ብር : ምዕስብተ “and while she was living as a widow” *Kebrā Nag.* p. 101, Note 11 (ምዕስብተ being a form not given in D.’s ‘*Lex.*’:—*cf.* *K. N., Introd.* p. XXXI)]. *Cf.* also DILLMANN’s ‘*Lex.*’, col. 652 *sq.* on word ንቡር, and *Chrest.* p. XVI.

(b) When the Word in Apposition is an Adjective.

(b) When the word in Apposition is an Adjective, it is usually supplemented,—inasmuch as it occupies a comparatively independent position in the sentence,—by a Suff. Pron. referring to the Noun to which the Adjective is in apposition, and having the force noticed in § 156. Thus we find: ምንት : አቀመከሙ : ዝየ : ዕሩዓኒከሙ (‘what makes you stand here, idling ones that you are?’) “why stand ye here idle?” Matt. 20, 6; አጎዝዎ : ለንጉሥ : ሕያዎ “they took the king alive” Josh. 8, 23; ዕራቅየ : እምፈነውከኒ “thou wouldest have sent me away empty” Gen. 31, 42; and similarly in the case of Verbs of Perception (*v. infra*); or when the word in apposition belongs to the Subject: ይኒይሰክ : ትባእ : ሐን ከስከ “it is better for thee to enter lame &c.” Matt. 18, 8; [እንዘ : ሀሎኩ : ንወ.ምየ “while I was asleep” *Kebrā Nag.* 63a 14*sq.*]; ወሐረ : ትኩዙ “and he went away grieved” Mark 10, 22⁽¹⁾; ዛቡሎን : ስኡኑ⁽²⁾ : ይኅድር Gen. 49, 13; እለ : ቅነታኒሆሙ : ይጸውሩ : ንዋየ : ሐቅል Judges 18, 11; አንሰ : ምልእትየ : ሐርኩ : ወዕራቅየ : አግብ አኒ : እግዚአብሔር Ruth 1, 21; 3, 17 (*cf.* § 156). But yet the Suffix is now and then considered unnecessary:—ንጉሥኪ : ይመጽእ : ጎቤኪ : የዋህ “thy king cometh to thee meek” Matt. 21, 5; ሀለዉ : ሰብአ : ከናአን : ጎዱራን Gen. 13, 7; አመ : እሰትዮ : ሐዲሰ “when I shall drink it new” Matt. 26, 29; ዘቀዳሜ : አሥገርከ : ዓሣ “whatever fish thou catchest first (‘as the first’)” Matt. 17, 27; ፈንዎቶ : አግዓዜ “to let him go free” Deut. 15, 18.

(c) But such an Apposition-form may be constituted even by

(1) V. analogous forms in Assyrian, HAUPT, ‘*Sum. Fam.-Ges.*’, p. 36 N. 2; [but on the other side, DELITZSCH, ‘*Assyr. Gramm.*’ § 80, b, a Note.]

(2) [*Cf.* LUDOLF’s ‘*Lex.*’ *in voce*, col. 173, and note his exceedingly ingenious explanation of the appearance of the word in this particular passage. TR.]

an *entire clause*, or at least by some verbal conception, which should properly be expressed as a Participle, but which is expressed in another way, *viz.* by the finite Verb,—seeing that Ethiopic is no longer capable of forming all the Participles. The Apposition-form may, *first*, be attached as an abbreviated circumstantial clause, *e. g.* ወአንሰ : ገጽየ : ታሕተ : እኔጽር “I looked, with face downward-turned” Hen. 14, 25; or,—*secondly*, it may be co-ordinated as an Imperfect by most intimate union, in accordance with § 181, *b*, β: ኮነ : ከመ : ጀእምኔነ : ያአምር “he has become as one of us, knowing” Gen. 3, 22; “I will show thee all my visions . . . በቅድሚክ : እነ ግር relating (them) in thy presence” Hen. 83, 1; “there were in that place about 3000 Philistines ይኔጽርዎ beholding him” Judges 16, 27;—*thirdly*, the Apposition-form may be rendered by እንዘ “while” and the finite verb, instead of by the Participle: ቀርቡ : ጎቤሁ : እንዘ : ይሚህር “they came to him while he was teaching” Matt. 21, 23; ሰርሑ : እንዘ : የጎሥሡ “they wearied themselves searching for” Gen. 19, 11; መጽኡ : እንዘ : ያሚከርዎ “they came tempting him” Matt. 16, 1; የሐውሩ : እንዘ : ይነፍጉ “they go blowing (trumpets)” Josh. 6, 9; ፈነዎሙ : እንዘ : ሕያው : ውእቱ “he sent them away while he yet lived” Gen. 25, 6; 46, 30; እንዘ : ምእትኑ : ዓመት : ሊተ : እወልድ “shall I, being a hundred years old, beget (a child)?” Gen. 17, 17. When the Predicate in the clause which has እንዘ is an Adjective, even Copula and Subject may then be wanting, the clause being more closely bound to the Noun of the Principal clause which it has to qualify: ዘይመ ውት : እንዘ : ጻድቅ : ውኄር “who, being righteous and good, dies” Hen. 81, 4; and if the noun which it has to qualify stands in the Accusative, the Predicate of the እንዘ-clause may even be in the Accusative: እመ : አድጎፀት : እንዘ : ምሰለ “if she have a miscarriage with a child fully formed” Ex. 21, 23. *Fourthly*, the Apposition may be brought out by the turn of expression described in § 181, *b*, α.

§ 190. (*d*) *Verbs of Perceiving, Declaring to be anything, and Turning into anything* deserve also special attention here⁽¹⁾. According to Ethiopic notions, that which anything is declared as being, or is turned into, or is perceived as being, should properly, if it is to be expressed by a verb, be co-ordinated, in the form of

(c) When an Entire Clause is in Apposition.

(d) Co-ordination of Predicate-Object with immediate Object, after Verbs of Perceiving, Declaring &c.

(1) Cf. also § 203 with the whole of this Section.

a Participle, with the immediate Object. Since, however, such a participle cannot always be formed, other modes of expression are available at need. 1. The Verbal conception, which has to indicate this Predicate-Object of the principal Verb, is co-ordinated,—as an Accusative of the Participle, with the immediate Object of the Verb (v. § 177, 4, *g*, and on the Passive construction, § 177, 5):—

ከያከ : ረከብከ : ጸድቀ “I have found thee righteous” Gen. 7, 1; **ርኢኩ : ኅዋኅወ : ሰማይ : ፍቱሐተ** “I saw the gates of heaven open” Hen. 34, 2; **ወረከብዎ : ለእግዚአሙ : ውዱቀ : ውስተ : ምድር : ምውተ** “and they found their lord fallen on the ground, dead” Judges 3, 25; Gen. 32, 2. Such a Participle may at the same time take the Suffix, by § 189, 3, *b*: **ማእዜ : ርኢናክ : ርጉበክ : —ወ ጽሙአክ** “when saw we thee hungry,—or thirsty?” &c. Matt. 25, 37, 38, 44; **ወርእዮ : ትኩዞ : ኢየሱስ** “and when Jesus saw him grieved” Luke 18, 24: and in the Passive construction: **ፀምረ : ጌዴዎን : ተረከበት : ጥልልታ** “Gideon’s fleece was found bedewed” (*Org. Mar.*).

2. As an Accusative of the Gerund, with or without Suffix.

2. The Verbal expression of the Apposition takes also the form of the Gerund (Infinitive) in the Accusative, with Suffix (*cf.* § 181, *b*, *α*)⁽¹⁾: **ማእዜ : ርኢናክ : ተሞቂሐክ** “when saw we thee a prisoner?” Matt. 25, 44; **ረከቦ : ለቀላሌሁ : ሐይዎ** “he found his servant recovered” Matt. 8, 13; and even without a Suffix:—**መነ : ትብሉኒ : ከዊነ** “whom say ye that I am?” Matt. 16, 15; **አምኑ : ውሉደ : እግዚአብሔር : ከዊነ : ሕዝብ ὠμολόγησαν θεοῦ υἱὸν εἶναι λαόν** Sap. 18, 13; also 1 Kings 3, 21; and continued by a finite verb, in:—**ለእመ : ርኢክ : ከልቦ : ኅዲኅ : እግዚአ : ወተለወክ : ገሮ : በእብን**—*Chrest.* p. 42, line 9 *sq.* These Accusatives with the Infinitive in the strict sense are to be found almost solely with Verbs of Perceiving and Declaring.

3. As a Finite Clause introduced by እንዘ, and equivalent to the Participle.

3. Very often the Participle is periphrastically expressed by እንዘ with the finite Verb:—**ርእየ : ካልኣነ : እንዘ : ይቀውሙ** “he saw others standing” Matt. 20, 3; Gen. 26, 8; **ረከቦሙ : እንዘ : ይነውሙ** “he found them sleeping” Matt. 26, 40; **ወቃለ : ካልኣ : ሰማዕኩ : እንዘ : ይበርክ** “and another voice I heard praising” Hen. 40, 5; or in Passive construction:—**ተረከበት : እንዘ : ባ : ውስተ : ማኅፀና** “she was found with child” Matt. 1, 18. Even when Adjectives and participles are procurable we come upon this እንዘ-form of expression, as in **ርእየ : ካም : እንዘ : ዕራቁ : ውእቱ** “Ham saw him naked” Gen. 9, 22. The im-

(1) [V. also PRAETORIUS’ *Aeth. Gramm.*, § 79. TR.]

mediate Object of the principal Verb is then frequently attracted, quite like a Subject, to the አንዘ-clause, but still it is set before it in most cases, as in **ርእያ : አዕይንትየ : በሀየ : ኩሎሙ : ኃጥአን : አንዘ : ይሰደዱ**. “my eyes saw there all sinners driven away” Hen. 41, 2.

4. The Predicate-Object is sometimes expressed by an independent clause, and this is directly subordinated, without the aid of any conjunction, to the Verb of Perceiving. In this case the immediate Object may either stand in the Accusative, dependent on the principal Verb, or, on the other hand, it may be attracted to the dependent clause as Subject; but yet, even in the latter case, it is usually left to occupy its position between the Principal Verb and the one which is subordinated (*Attraction*).

4. As an Independent Clause, subordinated directly to the Verb of Perceiving, without any Conjunction. *Attraction*.

Thus we find:—**ርእየ : ጢሰ : የዐርግ** “they saw smoke ascending (*lit.* ‘it was ascending’)” Josh. 8, 20; **ሰማዕከዎሙ : ይብሉ** “I heard them say” Gen. 37, 17; **ይሬአይዎ : ለወልደ : እንለ : እመሕያው : ይመጽእ** “they shall see the Son of Man coming” Matt. 24, 30; Hen. 32, 3; **ርእየሙ : ትኩዛን** “he saw them sad” (‘he saw them, they were sad’) Gen. 40, 6; **ርኢናሃ : ለይአቲ : ምድር : ሠናይት : ጥቀ** “we saw that land to be very good” (‘—it is very good’) Judges 18, 9; **ርኢከዎ : ለእግዚአብሔር : ይኑብር : ዲበ : መንበሩ** “I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne” Is. 6, 1, as quoted in *Gadla Yārēd*, 5, 29 sq.;—or with *Attraction*:—**ርእየ : ብእሲ : ይቀውም** “he saw (‘a man was standing’) a man standing” Josh. 5, 13; **ርኢኩ : . . . ሰማይ : ይትነፃፃ** “I saw . . . the heavens destroyed” Hen. 83, 3; Mark 1, 10; also in the following position: **ወናሁ : ኩሎሙ : እሠራን : ርኢኩ** “and lo, all of them I saw bound” Hen. 90, 23.

5. Farther, the independent Subordinate clause may, after Verbs of Perceiving and Saying, be subordinated to the principal Verb by **ከመ** “that” or “as”. Here also the immediate Object of the principal verb may be attracted to the dependent clause, but the delicacy of the language demands that in such a case there shall be attached to the principal verb a Suffix Pronoun referring to that Object: **አአምረከ : ከመ : ድሩክ : ብእሲ : አንተ⁽¹⁾** “I know (thee) that thou art an hard man” Matt. 25, 24, 26; **ሰምዕዎ : ከመ : ሀሎ : ውስተ : ቤት** “they heard (of him) that he was in the house” Mark 2, 1; Hen. 65, 1; 83, 4; Gen. 6, 2, 12; **ወሶበ : ርእያ : ከመ :**

5. As a Clause subordinated by **ከመ**.

(¹) One might also have said, it is true:—**አአምር : ከመ : ድሩክ : ብእሲ : አንተ**, but **አአምረከ** is more elegant.

ሠናይት : ይእቲ : ዕረፍት “and when he saw that rest was good” Gen. 49, 15. If the Predicate in the subordinate clause is not a Verb, but an Adjective (or Substantive), and the immediate Object is not attracted to the Subordinate clause,—the copula may be left out in the latter: **ርእዮ : ለብርሃን : ከመ : ሠናይ** “he saw the light (“that good”) that it was good”⁽¹⁾ Gen. 1, 4, 8. 6. After Verbs of *Causing* or *Making*, the Predicate-Object, when it has to be expressed by a finite Verb, is put in the Subjunctive, in accordance with § 183, *b, c*, with or without **ከመ**—: thus either like **ይሬስያ : ትዘመ** *ποισῇ αὐτῇ μοι χαῖσθαι* Matt. 5, 32; **እመ : አማን : መንፈስ : ቅዱስ : ታመስልዎ : ለመልክ : ጼዴቅ : ይኩን** *Chrest.* p. 91, line 16; or like **አሬስየክ : ከመ : ይፃእ : እምኔክ : አሕዛብ** Gen. 17, 6; **ትትአመን : ከመ : ያእቱ : ተግባረ : ማእረርክ** Job 39, 12; Ps. 26, 19; Rom. 15, 14; Hebr. 6, 9. In a singular fashion this subordination by means of the Subjunctive is met with even after Verbs of Saying (which Mood serves in this case to express Possibility, like the Optative in other languages): **መነ : ይብልዎ : ይኩን : ሰብእ** “whom say the people of him, that he is?” Matt. 16, 13.

ADDENDUM: UNION OF NUMERALS AND NOUNS.

§ 191. For the sake of clearness the joining of Numerals to Nouns falls to be dealt with here, rather than in the foregoing §§ 184, 185 & 188.

1. The Cardinal Numbers, with the exception of **አሐዱ**, are originally abstract Substantives, and accordingly should take to themselves the numbered object in the Genitive. Those forms of the Numerals, in fact, which are not increased by the Pronominal Suffix *ū*, are capable of taking the Constr. State. We find **ኅምስተ : ዕደው** “five men” Gen. 47, 2; **ስድስተ : ምእተ : ብእሲ** (Acc.) Judges 20, 39; **ኅምሳ : ምእተ : ብእሲ** Judges 20, 45; **ክልሐተ : አውራኅ** Judges 11, 37; but this mode of connection is very seldom adopted”⁽²⁾. Only, when the Object numbered is a Personal Pro-

(1) Instead of which we might have had **ርእዮ : ብርሃን : ከመ : ሠናይ : ውእቱ**.

(2) Cf. farther, however, Numb. 35, 14; 2 Peter 2, 5; [and v. *Kebra Nag. Introd.*, p. XVIII sq.].

noun, it is invariably attached as a Suffix to one or other of the Cardinal forms of the Numerals 3—10 mentioned above, and always by means of the Binding-vowel *i* in accordance with § 155, 3, *a*, as these numerals are Plural notions: **ሠለስቲሆሙ** “the three of them” and “the three”; **አርባዕቲሆሙ**, **ሰመንቲሆሙ** &c.⁽¹⁾. But if a word has to be subordinated by way of a partitive Genitive, like “three of those”, it is, in the case of all numerals without exception, attached by means of the preposition **እምነ**, in accordance with § 186, *c*: **፩እምዐሠርቱ : ወክልኤቱ** “one of the Twelve” Matt. 26, 47; **አሐቲ : እምነገደ : እስራኤል** “one of the tribes of Israel” Gen. 49, 16 &c.

The usual mode of connecting the numbered Object with the numeral is, for all numbers, that of co-ordination (§ 188); and it has been already pointed out in § 158, that for that very reason the pronominal *u* is commonly attached to the Numerals 1—10. They are connected with the Noun entirely like other Adjectives, or,—to be more exact,—like **ነሱ** (§ 188). When the Noun is in the Accusative, they likewise take the Accusative so far as they can form such a Case: **ክልኤ : ምእት : ዲድረከመ** Josh. 7, 21; **እልፈ : ብእሴ** Judges 1, 4; 8, 4; **ዐሠርት : ወሰመንት : ዓመት** “18 years” Josh. 24, 33 (LXX); Judges 3, 14; Luke 13, 16; **ምእት : ዲናረ** Matt. 18, 28; **አርባዕት : ምእት : ዓመት** Gen. 15, 13; **ዐሠርት : ወክልኤት : ዓመት** Gen. 14, 4. However, the Fem. Numeral in *u*, like **ዐሥሩ**, according to § 158, no longer admits of an Accusative: we have therefore **ስሱ : ኅዋኅወ** Hen. 72, 3; **ሰብዑ : ኅብስት** Matt. 15, 36; **ዐሥሩ : ደናግለ** Matt. 25, 1; and occasionally the Masc.-forms, **ዐሠርቱ** &c., follow the same course. Even the plural forms of **ምእት** and **እልፍ** may be connected with the Object numbered, just like Adjectives; for example, in the Nominative: **አእላፍ : ወትእልፊት : አእላፋት : መላእክት** Hen. 71, 13⁽²⁾.

Since definite plurality is already expressed by the Numeral, the Object numbered is most frequently connected with it in the Singular, *e. g.* **፯፻ወ፩ : ዓመት** Gen. 8, 13; **ሠላሳ : ብሩረ** (Acc.) Matt. 26, 15. Yet the Plural may also be used (just as with **ነሱ** § 188): **ኅምሳ : ጸድቃን** Gen. 18, 24 *sqq.*; **ዐሠርቱ : ወሠለስቱ : አህ**

(1) Cf. also **ኅምሳሆሙ** 4 Kings 1, 14.

(2) [Instead of this reading of DILLMANN's, FLEMMING gives **አእላፍ : ወትእልፊት : መላእክት**. TR.]

ጉር Josh. 21, 4; **ምእት : አባገዕ** Matt. 18, 12; Josh. 24, 32; **ዐሠርቱ : ወክልኤቱ : መሳፍንት** Gen. 25, 16, or **አርዳኢሁ** (in the Gospels); **አልፈ : መክልዩ** Matt. 18, 24; **ሰብዐቱ : አኅወ** Matt. 22, 25. A Pronoun with a Numeral takes the plural, for the reason that, as a rule, it precedes it (§ 188): **አልከቱ : ኅምስቱ** Gen. 14, 9; **አሉ : ሠለስቱ** Gen. 9, 19; **አልኩ : ፬ ገጽ** Hen. 40, 3; **በአላንቱ : ክልኤ : ትእዛዝ** Matt. 22, 40. Adjectives also regularly take the Plural, even when the Substantive remains Singular: **ሰብዐቱ : ሠዊት : ቀጢናን : ወዕቡራን** Gen. 41, 5—7; or **ሰብዐተ : ክልኣነ : መናፍስተ** Matt. 12, 45. But we may also have **ክልእተ : ኅምስ : መክሊተ** Matt. 25, 16; **ክልእተ : ሰብዐተ : ዓመተ** Gen. 29, 30,—in both of which cases, besides, **ክልእተ** has to be closely drawn to the numeral: “another ‘five’ talents”.

As regards the Gender of Numerals we have a recurrence of the fluctuations sketched in § 188. We say, for instance, both **ዐሥሩ : ወሠላስ : አህጉር** Josh. 21, 6, 33 or **ዐሥሩ : ወክልኤ : አህጉር** &c. Josh. 21, 7, 18, 19, 22, 24, 26, 29, 32, 38—, and **ዐሠርቱ : ወሠለስቱ : አህጉር** Josh. 21, 4 &c.

The Numeral is regularly put before the Object numbered. It is only on special grounds that it may come after it, *e. g.* Gen. 32, 15, 16; 49, 28; 1 Kings 25, 5. Every Number is farther capable of standing by itself in a sentence, without being joined to any numbered Object, *e. g.* **ዐሠርተ : ምእተ** “a thousand” (*Acc.*) Josh. 23, 10.

If the object numbered is a *Measure, Weight*, or the like, it is for the most part connected with the Numeral by the preposition **በ**⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* **፫፻በአመት : ኑታ** “its length (shall be) 300 cubits” (*lit.* ‘in cubits’) Gen. 6, 15; Hen. 7, 2; John 21, 8; **ወኮነ : ድልወተ : ወርቀ : አዕኑጊሁ : ዘሰአሎሙ : ዐሠርተ : ወትስዐተ : ምእተ : በሰቅል** Judges 8, 26. Thus also we find: **ወኮነ : ስገሙ : በመስፈርተ : ኢፍ** “and the barley in it amounted to the measure of an ephah” Ruth 2, 17.

The Numeral-forms, described in § 159, *b*, which are employed to enumerate Days and Months, may also indeed be connected, as Substantives, with the object numbered, by means of the Constr. St., as in **ሰቡዐ : ዕለት** Ex. 7, 25; but usually they take the numbered object in apposition to themselves, just like the

(1) Cf. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ p. 689.

other Numerals (v. Examples, § 159, *b*). Where they stand independently for the “so-and-soth (day)”, they are generally supplemented by a Suffix referring to Day or Month, as in Gen. 8, 14; Lev. 23, 6; Numb. 29, 12; Gen. 7, 11; 8, 4.

2. The *Numeral Adjectives (Ordinals)*, must, like all other 2. Ordinal
adjectives, take the Case (and Gender) of the Noun to which they Numbers.
are joined: በረብዕ : ትውልድ Gen. 15, 16; በሣልስት : ዕለት Gen. 22, 4. On some few occasions only the Numeral Adjective takes the Constr. St. and makes the Noun dependent upon it: በሳኒት : ዕለት “on the following day” Josh. 10, 32: this occurs oftener in denoting Fractional numbers (§ 159, *f*).

When the object enumerated is not expressly mentioned along with the Numeral Adjective, and when the latter has thus more of a Substantive character, like “the third”, then it must, in accordance with § 185, *ad fin.*, be completed by a Suffix referring to the omitted Noun: ወከማሁ : ካልኡኒ : ወሣልሱሂ : እስከ : ሰባትሁሙ “likewise the second also and the third, unto the seventh (‘the seven’)” Matt. 22, 26; ወካልእታሂ “and the second (commandment)” Matt. 22, 39; Ruth 1, 4; ከመ : ካልእታ “like the other” Matt. 12, 13; አሐደ : ይነሥኡ : ወካልኦ : የኅድጉ Matt. 24, 40; በሣልስታ “on the third (day)” Luke 2, 46; በሳኒታ “on the following day” Matt. 27, 62; so too, always:—አሐዱ : ምስለ : ካልኡ “with one another”⁽¹⁾. Again, the Numeral Adjective sometimes attaches to itself a Suffix with a possessive force referring to the principal Noun in the sentence: “and she said to Ruth:—አተወት : ካልእትኪ the other (*lit.* ‘thine other’) has gone home; (do thou also return)” Ruth 1, 15; ኅየሰት : ምሕረት : ደኃሪት : እምነ : ቀዳሚትኪ “the last kindness is more excellent still than the first (*lit.* ‘thy first’)” Ruth 3, 10; ናሁ : ሣልሶሙ : የም : እንዘ : ይጸንሑኒ “behold, to-day is the third (*lit.* ‘their third’ *i. e.* ‘day’) that they have been attending upon me” Mark 8, 2; “because thou saidst, ‘I hate her’, ወሀብክም : ለካልእከ I then gave (her) to another” (*lit.* ‘thine other’, *i. e.* ‘another than thou’) Judges 15, 2; “the youngest is with his father ወካልኡሰ : ሞተ but the other (‘to him’) is dead” Gen. 42, 13;

⁽¹⁾ But yet “one another” is frequently expressed in Ethiopic, and in Semitic generally, by the repetition of the Noun itself, as in እብን : ዲበ : እብን “one stone upon another” Matt. 24, 2; መራዕየ : እመራዕየ Gen. 32, 17 &c.

32, 20; “the same beast **ሐምሮሙ፡ ውእቱ** is the eighth (‘to them’)” Rev. 17, 11.—Farther, when it is said of any one that he is doing something ‘for the so-and-soth time’, this may be expressed by the Numeral Adjective, placed in apposition to the acting Subject, and supplemented by a Suffix referring to that Subject (§ 189, 3, b): “thou smitest me **ናሁ፡ ሣልስከ፡ ዝንቱ** now for the third time” Numb. 22, 28; 24, 10; “he has defrauded me **ወናሁ፡ ዳግሙ፡ የ-ም** even to-day for the second time” Gen. 27, 36. But yet we may also say, more simply: **ወናሁ፡ ሣልስ፡ ዝንቱ፡ እንዘ፡ ታስተሐቅረኒ** “and lo, thou art mocking me now for the third time” Judges 16, 15; Numb. 14, 22; 22, 32.

The Cardinal Number is often used for the Ordinal, or Numeral Adjective, not only in the case of the higher numbers,—which have no Adjective forms,—but also in the case of the lower ones, *e. g.* **በአሐቲ፡ ጥንት** “in the first gate” Hen. 72, 25; **ወሞተ፡ የሴፍ፡ በምእት፡ ወዐሠርቱ፡ ዓመት** “and Joseph died in the hundred-and-tenth year” Gen. 50, 26; 16, 16; 17, 1, 24. Particularly when hours (of the day) are numbered, the Ethiopians prefer to employ the cardinal forms: **ጊዜ፡ ሠላስ፡ ሰዓት** “about the third hour” Matt. 20, 3, 5, 6; 27, 45 (yet *v.* **በቀዳሚት፡ ሰዓት** Judges 7, 19 [and *cf. Test. Ad.* (ed. BEZOLD, in ‘*Oriental. Studien*’, 1906,) p. 899 *sqq.*]), just as one may also say **በዓመት፡ ፭፻** “in the five hundredth year” Hen. 60, 1.

B. STRUCTURE OF THE SIMPLE SENTENCE.

§ 192. Having shown how the chief members of the Sentence,—*viz.*, the Subject and the Predicate,—may be extended into larger groups of words, we proceed to deal with these members themselves, and with the combining of them into a Sentence.

1. *The Subject.* Every Sentence, which is not imperfect, must contain a Subject, *i. e.* a theme (whether person, thing, idea, fact, or relation), of which something is predicated. Such Subject is usually a Substantive (—it may also be an Infinitive, *e. g.* Matt. 15, 20; 17, 4; 1 Cor. 9, 15), or a Pronoun representing a Substantive⁽¹⁾; but it may also be an Adjective if it is invested

(¹) This may even be wanting, and in that case it must be supplied from the sense,—*cf. e. g.* Tobit 10, 12; **አክብሪ፡ ታሕማክ፡ እስመ፡ እም ይአዜስ፡ ዘመድኹ** αὐτοὶ νῦν γονεῖς σου εἰσίν.

with the force of a Substantive, or even an Adverb, when through the stimulus of speech the Adverb is raised to the position of a Noun-Substantive, as, for instance, **የ-ም** in Mark 8, 2. An entire sentence even may take the place of Subject, particularly a Relative or a Conditional Sentence, *e. g.* **የአክሊኒ : ዘረከብኩ : ሞገሰ** “it is enough for me that I have found favour” Gen. 33, 15; **ኢያሐዝነኩት : እንዘ : ንመውት** “does it give thee no concern that (‘when’) we are perishing?” Mark 4, 38—, just as in other languages.

As, according to § 101, the finite Verb invariably contains the Person, enclosed along with the assertion,—every Sentence which is expressed by means of a finite verb is properly furnished already with its Subject, even when the latter is not distinctly mentioned. And yet that designation of the Subject which is contained in the Verb is very defective, if the Verb is in the third person, because the pronoun contained in the Verb merely points to *some* Subject, either a person, a thing or an idea; and thus it is left undetermined *what* the Subject is which is indicated in this way. In by far the greater number of sentences the Subject is therefore expressly introduced by name, or at least the context makes it clear, *who* or *what* is meant, in each particular case, by the Person which is inherent in the Verb. There are, however, sentences in which a verb in the third person stands quite by itself, neither having a Subject expressly mentioned, nor requiring a Subject to be supplied from the context. These cases fall now to be specially described.

(a) There is *an indefinite mode of expression*, in which the speaker does not distinctly mention the Subject of an action, even though it is a living being,—a person,—because he either does not know that being or does not desire to mention it, being more concerned with the Action (Assertion) than with the person acting. In this case when the Ethiopians did not wish to put **ሰብእ** or **ብእሱ** “people” or “one” directly, for the undefined person, they employed mostly the third person Masc. Pl.:—**ወአይድዕዋ : ለርብቃ** “and they told Rebecca” Gen. 27, 42; **ኢይቀድሙ : ውሂበ** “they do not give first” Gen. 29, 26; 31, 26; Hen. 14, 19⁽¹⁾; 22, 3; 31, 3;

(a) In-
definite
Mode of Ex-
pression.

(1) [FLEMMING, however, reads here **ወኢይክል : ርእየ** “and I could not look (‘at it’, *i. e.* ‘at the fire’)”, as translating the Greek *καὶ οὐκ ἔδυνασάμην ἰδεῖν*,—instead of DILLMANN’S **ወኢይክል : ርእየ-ቶ** “and people could not look at it”. TR.]

Judges 16, 2 &c.; and at rare times the third person Masc. Sing., *e. g.* **ከመ : ይአሥርክ** “that he (one) bind thee” Hen. 13, 1.

(b) Impersonal Mode
of Expression

(b) Then there is an *Impersonal mode of expression*, which is made use of when the speaker is concerned merely with the predication,—and not with the person or thing of which he predicates,—and therefore puts the predication in the third person Sing. Masc., without explaining whom or what he means by the pronoun which is inherent in the verb. We employ in our own tongue the impersonal “it” in such cases. Many impersonal verbs of this kind occur in Ethiopic, and always in the third pers. Sing. Masculine (not Feminine): **ይዘንም** “it will rain” Matt. 16, 3; **መስየ** “it is drawing towards evening” Matt. 16, 2; **ኮነ : ሐዋዩ** “it has become evening-red” Matt. 16, 2; **አከለ** “it amounts to”; **ኮነ** “it is permitted” and “it is sufficient”⁽¹⁾ Dent. 3, 26; **ይጸብብ** “it is confining” &c. There are even impersonal clauses, in which no finite verb is contained at all, like **ወሶበ : ለሐዊራ** “and when it was about the time of her setting out” Judges 1, 14. When such impersonal clauses take the Infinitive form, they show the Suffix of the third person Sing. Masc. as Subject (v. § 181, b, α, *ad fin.*), *e. g.* **ወመን ፈቀ : ሌሊት : ከዊኖ** “and when it was midnight” Ruth 3, 8.

Finally, a *feebly personal mode of expression* is very frequently employed, in which a verb makes its appearance at first indeed in a form seemingly impersonal, but forthwith receives a certain substitute for the missing Subject, supplied in a clause of its own. Such a substitutionary clause would, in English or German, take the form of an Infinitive with “to”, or be introduced by “that”, “if” or some other Conjunction. In particular we find employed in this way: **ኮነ** and **ብዉሕ** “it is permitted”; **ኮነ** “it is enough”; **መፍትወ** “it is necessary”; **ይደሉ** “it is suitable or becoming” (with Acc. ‘for any one’); **ይረትዕ** “it is right”; **ይቀልል** “it is easy”; **ይኤድም** “it pleases” Josh. 9, 23; **ይበቀላዕ** “it is profitable”; **ይኄ ይስ** “it is better”; **ይዉኒ** or **ወናይ** “it is good”; **አከለ** “it is enough”; **ጠብዐ** “it is customary” (G. Ad.); **ይቀድም** (with Acc.) “it falls first to” (‘any one’) Ruth 4, 4; **ይመስል** and **ያስተርኢ** “it seems”; **ሀለወ** “it is about to happen” (with a Subjunctive following); and

(1) On the other hand the Ethiopians employ always **ኮነ**, with a personal reference, for our “it goes, or fares in such and such a way with me”, *e. g.* **አመ : ከመዝ : አከውን** “if it will fare so with me” Gen. 25, 22.

others⁽¹⁾. It has already been pointed out how such verbs take to themselves the clause representing the Subject, sometimes in the form of the Accusative of the Infinitive (§ 182, *a*, α) or the Nominative of the Infinitive (*ibid.*), sometimes as a Subjunctive in immediate subordination (§ 182, *b*, β) or connected by means of **ከመ** (§ 182, *b*, γ). They may also introduce such representative of the Subject in some other fashion, as, for instance, in **ኢይኩንከ : ዕጸ. በ : ቅድሚከ : በእንተ : ውእቱ : ሕፃን** “let it not seem grievous in thy sight because of the lad” Gen. 21, 12; or with **እስመ**, *e. g.* **ይኩንከሙ : ለከሙ : እስመ** “let it be enough for you, that” Numb. 16, 3; or through **ዘ**, *e. g.* **ኢክለከኒት : ዘነሣእከኒት : ምትዩ** “is it not enough for thee that thou hast taken my husband from me?” Gen. 30, 15; 33, 15. To such semi-personal sentences belongs also:—**ወለምንት : እንከ : ሊተ : አሐዩ** “and what then shall it avail me that I live?” Gen. 27, 46.

But to this class of phrases belong quite specially the very frequently used words **በ** “there is *or* are” and **አልበ** “there is *or* are not” (or **ቦቱ** and **አልቦቱ**), §§ 167, 1, *b*; 176, *h*. In distinction from **በ** “he has” (§ 176, *h*) the **በ**, which calls for description here, regularly takes to itself in the Nominative the word which in the sense of a Subject completes its meaning: **በቅድሚሁ : አልበ : ማኅ ለቅት** “before him there is no ceasing”⁽²⁾ Gen. 39, 11; 49, 2; 58, 3: this is always the case, when it is used directly for “there is”; “there is not”. When, on the other hand, **በ** has rather the force of “one finds” or “one meets with”, it may take its Subject also in the Accusative (*cf.* § 176, *h*):—**በ : ሕፅዋን** “there are eunuchs” Matt. 19, 12; **ቦቱ : ኅቤኑ : ሣዕረ : ወእክለኒ** “we have both straw and provender” Gen. 24, 25; 42, 1 &c. This form, **በ** or **አልበ**, has become so common that it is often used even to introduce a question, either alone, *e. g.* in Judges 4, 20, or along with an interrogative, *e. g.* in **ቦት : ዐቃቢሁ : አነ** “am I his keeper?” Gen. 4, 9, where it is the prop of the interrogative (*v.* also § 198): or it is employed with **ዘ** or **ከመ** following, in the sense of—“it is the case that . .”:

(1) To this class belong turns of expression like **ምንት : አሥሐቃ** “*cur ridere eam fecit?*”; *cf.* DILLMANN'S ‘*Lex.*’ col. 188, and 4 Esr. 9, 39 (Laur. 40).

(2) Here and there, a Personal Suffix in the sense of a Dative is met with, instead of the neutral \bar{o} in **በ** and **አልበ**, *e. g.* in **ወቀዊም : አልበሙ**, literally—“and standing is not in them”, *i. e.* “there is no standing for them” Gen. 41, 2. [FLEMMING reads here **ወቀዊመ : አልበሙ**. TR.]

— **ለእመሥጋዊ** : **ዘወለድኩ** “should it be the case that thou beget children” Gen. 48, 6; **እመሥጋዊ** : **ከመ** : **ኮነ** : **ድኅረ** “if in later times it happen . .” Josh. 22, 28; Gen. 42, 38; or a periphrasis is constructed out of it and a relative following, to indicate the idea of “something”, “some”, “a few” (§ 173):—we even have **ሀ** : **አመ** “sometimes”⁽¹⁾ Matt. 17, 15; and repeated = “*modo—modo*”. Lastly, **ወኮነ** is often used impersonally, like the Hebrew **וַיָּבֹא** and **וַיָּהֲרֹא**, with the force of “and it came to pass”,—to which introductory phrase it is better to attach what came to pass, without the **ወ** than with it: **ወኮነ** : **በይእቲ** : **ዕለት** : **በጽሐ** Gen. 26, 32; 27, 1; 41, 1; Hen. 52, 7 (where the Indic. **ይከውን** appears); **ወኮነ** : **ሶበ** : **ወለደት** : **ወመንታ** : **ሀለው** : **ውስተ** : **ከርሣ** Gen. 38, 27; or even by **ከመ** and the Subjunctive: **ወኮነ** : **እምድኅረዝ** : **ከመ** : **ትትከበት** : **መንፈስዩ** Hen. 71, 1.

(c) Passive
Construction.

(c) When the Subject which performs the action is suppressed, the *Passive construction* is frequently made use of instead of the Active, and then the Object of the action becomes the grammatical Subject. This Passive construction is pretty common in Ethiopic, e. g. **ተወልዱ** : **ሎቱ** : **፵ ደቂቅ** “there were born to him forty sons” Judges 12, 14; **ጸሎቶሙ** : **ለጻድቃን** : **ተሰምዐ** “the prayer of the righteous ones was heard” Hen. 47, 4; **ከመ** : **ትጸላ** : **እ** : **ልያ** “that Leah is (was) hated” Gen. 29, 31; **እምትካትሰ** : **አከ** : **ከመዝ** : **ዘተገብረ** “in olden times it was not so done” Matt. 19, 8; Hen. 48, 2; 50, 2; 57, 2. And yet the Passive construction, found in other languages, is frequently replaced by the indefinite mode of expression in the Active (v. *supra* a): **ወይቤልዎ** : **ለአብራም** *καὶ ἐβῆσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ* Gen. 15, 13; **ይቅትልዎ** *ἀποθάνετω* Judges 6, 30 &c. A Passive verb may also be used in an impersonal or feebly personal way (v. *supra* b), e. g. **ተብህለ** “it is said” Luke 4, 12; **ይትፈቀድ** “it is required”; **ይትከህል** “it is possible”; **ተስእነ** “it is impossible”. In the case of such verbs the clause which has to serve as Subject, is annexed to them by the same turns of phrase as in the case of other feebly personal verbs, e. g. **ወአልሶ** : **ዘይትከህል** : **ይትገባእ** : **እምኔከ** “nothing can be concealed from thee” Hen. 9, 5. Now, seeing that a Passive Verb in the 3rd pers. Sing. Masc., used in a feebly personal sense, expresses

(1) [*Cf.* similar phrases of Indefiniteness in Greek and Latin with *ἔστιν* (v) and *est*: e. g. *ἔστιν ὅτε*, *est ubi* &c. TB.]

exactly as much as an Active Verb in the 3rd pers. Pl. Masc., used indefinitely (*e. g.* ተብህለ and ይብሉ “they say”), and farther, seeing that other feebly personal verbs may take to themselves a supplementary form in the Accusative, by way of Subject (§ 182, *a, α*), it is not a matter of astonishment that in the Passive form of expression in Ethiopic the Object of an action,—instead of being in the Nominative as grammatical Subject,—may even be in the Accusative⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* ተሰምዮ : ስሞ : ኤዶም “there was called his name, (*i. e.* “they called his name”) Edom” Gen. 25, 30; Deut. 28, 10; ይትቤቀል : ኩሉ “retribution will be exacted for every thing” Hen. 25, 4; Sap. 11, 4 (A); 14, 7 (A); Deut. 28, 10; 4 Esr. 2, 22 var.; 4 Esr. 6, 65 (Laur. 75); 4 Esr. 9, 24 (Laur. 27); 4 Esr. 10, 51 (Laur. 65); and even in the case of the Passive Participle: ዘሥዮም : ለነ : አብያተ 4 Esr. 7, 16 (Laur. 24).

The Passive construction is not so often met with in Ethiopic, if the acting Subject is mentioned at the same time. In that case the Subject must be introduced by a Preposition denoting a relation of causality; in comparatively rare instances, by ለ, *e. g.* ትከውን : ምወ.አ : ሎቱ *Chrest.* p. 43, line 22; ወይትሌበው : ለሰማዕ ያን *ibid.* 45, l. 24; oftener by በ, to express the instrumentality or any impersonal cause, but also said of Persons with the meaning “by” (Agency), *e. g.* ዘይትገበር : በኖሎት “what is done by the shepherds” Hen. 89, 62; Matt. 14, 2 (*cf.* 2, 17; 21, 4); and by እምነ (and እም) to express the doer, *e. g.* ተበልዑ : እምነ : ኩሉሙ : አራዊተ : ገዳም “they were devoured by all the beasts of the field” Hen. 89, 57 (*cf.* § 164, 3); እመላእክት : በሰማያት : ትሰገድ : ⁽²⁾ ወእም አበውኒ : በምድር : ትሴባሕ : ወእምነቢያት : ትትከበር : ወእምሐዋርያት : ትሰበክ : ወእምአብያተ : ክርስቲያናት : እስከ : ይእዜ : ትትዔቦይ : ወትሴባሕ *Chrest.* p. 78, line 25 *sqq.*; here and there also by Compounds of እም, *e. g.* እምቅድመ in the case of ተውህበ Hen. 37, 4, or እምነበ.

§ 193. 2. *The Predicate* of a Sentence is usually a Verb or an Adjective (or Participle). Certain Adjectives, when used as Predicates, are in all cases, or at least in certain cases, supplemented by a Suffix (*v.* §§ 156; 191). Those Adjectives and Participles also, which are formed by periphrasis with the Relative Pron. (§ 202), have as Pre-

2. The
Predicate.

(¹) For the Hebrew, *cf.* EWALD § 295, *b.*

(²) On the other hand, the construction in the Active is—ሰገደ : ለ.

dicates the same construction as the ordinary Adjectives, *e. g.* **ወይከ ውን : ደኃሪቱ : ዘየአከ : እምቀዳሚቱ** “and his latter condition is worse than his earlier one” Matt. 12, 45; and those also which are formed by the Genitive sign **ዘ**, *e. g.* **ወልብሱ : ዘጸጉረ : ገመል** “and his raiment was of camel’s hair” Mark 1, 6 (*cf.* § 186, *a*, *δ*); **እስመ : እሙን ቱ : ዘሥጋ** “for they are mortal (‘flesh’)” Gen. 6, 3; and the Possessive Pronouns, described in § 150, *e. g.* **ዚአን : ማይ** “the water is ours” Gen. 26, 20; **እንተ : ኢኮነት : እንቲአሆሙ** “which is not theirs” Gen. 15, 13, even when they are still farther strengthened by the Relative Pronoun being prefixed to them, as in **ኩሉ : ዘትሬኢ : ዘዚአየ : ውእቱ** “all that thou seest is mine” Gen. 31, 43. The Predicate also may take the form of a repetition of the Verb, as in **ወየዐቢ : ወየዐቢ : ጥቀ** Gen. 26, 13. In like manner the Genitives which are described in § 186, *a*, *γ*, when employed with the force of Adjectives, may take the position of the Predicate: **አን ትሙ : ዘክርስቶስ** “ye are Christ’s” 1 Cor. 3, 23.

But in fact all the other classes of words may likewise take the place of Predicate, especially Nouns-Substantive (Infinitives) and Numerals, as in **ወኩሉ : ነፍስ : ሠላሳ : ወሠለስቱ** “all the souls were thirty and three” Gen. 46, 15. Substantives often express the Predicate-idea more vigorously and comprehensively than an Adjective or Participle, *e. g.* **ጽዕለት : ውእቱ : ለነ** “it is a disgrace to us” Gen. 34, 14; **ኩሉ : ምግባራቲሃ : ዕልወት** “all her works are apostasy (*i. e.* ‘nothing but apostasy’)” Hen. 93, 9. The Substantive is also used in default of an Adjective which would express exactly the same meaning, and where the Genitive of the Substantive might also in many instances be employed: **ወምድሩ : በረድ** “and its floor was crystal” (= **ዘበረድ** “crystalline”, *or* “of crystal”) Hen. 14, 10; **ወሰማየሙ : ማይ** “and their heaven was water” Hen. 14, 11; **ወፍሬሁኒ : ጥገስ : ጥቀ : ለርእየ : ገጽ** “its fruit is delightful to behold” (where an adverb even is connected with the Substantive which is used for an Adjective) Hen. 24, 5; 88, 1; 21, 8⁽¹⁾; 22, 2. Farther, Nouns with Prepositions also serve as Predicate, *e. g.* **ውእቱ : ኅቤየ** “he is (devoted) to me” Gen. 29, 34; **እምነ : ዐጽምየ : ወእምነ : ሥጋየ : አንተ** “of my bone and of my flesh art thou” Gen. 29, 14; **እምዕፁብ : በአቱ : መንግሥተ : ሰማያት** “his entry

(¹) [FLEMMING, however, reads here the Participle **ሕሙም**, not like DILLMANN the Substantive **ሕማም**. TR.]

into the kingdom of heaven is a matter of difficulty” Matt. 19, 23 (cf. § 173); **አስመ : ለዓለም : ምሕረቱ** “for his mercy (is) for ever” Ps. 135, 1, and of frequent occurrence; **ሰይፍ : ምሉኅ : ውስተ : እደ ሁ** “a drawn sword (was) in his hand” Josh. 5, 13; **ኩሉ : ግብሩ : ምስሉ : ቅዱሳን** “all his doings (were) with the holy ones” Hen. 12, 2. And in conformity therewith even true Adverbs may form the Predicate, so far as they also express the same qualifications of condition as a Noun with a Preposition, *e. g.* **አሉ : ዕደው : ስንክ : እሙንቱ : ምስሉን** “these men are at peace with us” Gen. 34, 21; 42, 19; **እምነ : መሬት : ታሕተ : ተስፋ-ሁ** γῆς εὐτελεστέρα ἢ ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ Sap. 15, 10. Lastly, even whole clauses serve as Predicate, particularly Relative Clauses, and abbreviated Relative Clauses, just as in other languages.

Here we must notice the peculiar use of **ብሂል** “to say”, as the Predicate of a short clause: **ዝውእቱ : ብሂል** “that is to say” —is the standing formula for “that is”, “that means”, *e. g.* in Matt. 27, 47; also in **ዘእምአቡየ : ብሂል** “which is to say, ‘of my father’”, or “that is, of my father” Gen. 19, 37. It is then generally shortened into **ብሂል**, *e. g.* in **ይሳኮር : ዐስብ : ብሂል** “Issachar, (‘hire’, to say) that is,—‘hire’” Gen. 30, 18; Mark 3, 17; 5, 41; and it is employed whenever foreign words are explained, *e. g.* in Ethiopic-Amharic lists of words [the so-called *sawāsew*].

§ 194. 3. Union of Subject and Predicate.

(a) When the Predicate is not a full Verb, but a Noun of some kind, we employ in our own (Western) languages the auxiliary verb “to be”, to join Subject and Predicate together, or to introduce the Predicate. But in Ethiopic, as in the other Semitic tongues, such a connecting-word is, in the first place, not absolutely necessary: Subject and Predicate may be directly placed side by side; and then the sense and context show of themselves what syntactical force is attributable to the two severally in this combination, *e. g.* **ከመ : ጥጻ : ባሕር : ብዝኖሙ** “as the sand of the sea (is) their multitude” Josh. 11, 4; **ፍውሐት : እምወይን : አዕይንቲሁ** “joyous with wine (are) his eyes” Gen. 49, 12. This juxtaposition of Subject and Predicate, without any connecting-word, is in most frequent use when the Subject is a Pronoun and comes second; for in that case misunderstanding is the less likely to prevail, as the Predicate would have had to be put after the Pronoun, if such predicate had been intended merely as a word in Apposi-

3. Union of Subject and Predicate:—

(a) Connecting-words when Predicate is a Noun of some kind.

tion. Accordingly we say: መሬት : አንተ “dust thou (art)” Gen. 3, 19; ብፁዓን : አንተሙ “blessed (are) ye” Matt. 5, 11; ብዙኃን : ንሕነ “many (are) we” Mark 5, 9; ዘእግዚአብሔር : እነ “I (am) of God” Gen. 50, 19; ጎላፊት : ንሕነ “strangers (are) we” Judg. 19, 18; አይቲ : አንተ “where (art) thou?” Gen. 3, 9; ምንት : ተግባርክሙ “what is your occupation?” Gen. 46, 33. But in many other cases this sense of a union between the two might not be immediately and invariably obvious; and it might then be possible to mistake the true relation of the two words for a relation of mere apposition. Accordingly in such cases Subject and Predicate are at once separated and connected by the insertion or addition of a Personal Pronoun of the third person. This Pronoun,—*the Copula*,—has in fact to discharge the function of signifying that the Subject-word and Predicate-word, although not to be bound immediately together, yet stand in a most important personal or individual relation to one another, and that the Predicate-word is nothing other than the attribute asserted of the Subject-word as the person or thing referred to. In other words, a personal Pronoun is assigned to the Predicate-word in order to turn it completely into a Predicate, precisely as the inflected Verb always encloses in its framework the Personal sign as the ligament between Subject and Predicate. Thus we say: እስመ : ረሐብ : ይእቲ : ምድር : ቅድሚሆሙ “for the land is spacious before them” (while the sentence, without ይእቲ would mean: “for a spacious land is before them”) Gen. 34, 21. The employment of this connecting-word is also necessary, when for special reasons (§ 196) the Subject comes first, *e. g.* in እሉ : እሙንቱ : ደቂቀ : ኤሌማ “these are the children of Oholibamah” Gen. 36, 14.—But, starting from those cases in which the use of the Copula was essential to clearness of meaning, it has spread to many cases in Ethiopic, in which it might have been dispensed with.—The Copula is then placed either before or after the Predicate, but preferably between Subject and Predicate: ብዙኃን : እሙንቱ : ጽዑዓን “many are called” Matt. 20, 16; ተዓይነ : እግዚአብሔር : ይእቲ : ዛቲ “this is the camp of God” Gen. 32, 3; መኑ : ውእቱ : ዝንቱ “who is this?” Matt. 21, 10; ዛቲ : ይእቲ : ሥርዐትዮ “this is my covenant” Gen. 17, 10; እሉ : ሠላስቱ : አስካል : ሠላስ : መዋዕል : እማንቱ “these three clusters of grapes are three days” Gen. 40, 12. Farther the Copula is necessary, when the Subject is a Relative pronoun: ዘውእቱ :

Personal
Pronoun
as *Copula*.

መራኒሆሙ “who is their leader” Hen. 72, 1; **እንተ፡ ይእቲ፡ ኬብሮን** “which is Hebron” Gen. 35, 37; **ዘውእቶሙ፡ ሴም፡ ወካም፡ ወያፌት** “who are Shem, Ham and Japhet” Gen. 5, 32. The Gender and Number of the connecting pronoun, when Subject and Predicate do not agree in these points, may be regulated either by the Subject or the Predicate, but the latter method is the usual one⁽¹⁾: **ከመዝ፡ ውእቱ፡ አስማቲሆሙ** “their names are these” Gen. 46, 8; **ምንት፡ ውእቱ፡ እሉ፡ እሙንቱ** “what are these?” Hen. 52, 3; **መኑ፡ ውእቶሙ፡ እሉ፡ ፬ ገጽ** “who (‘whose’) are these four faces?” Hen. 40, 8. Of course the Copula may also stand when the Subject is a Pronoun of the first or second Person: **አንትሙ፡ ውእቱ፡ ብርሃኑ፡ ለዓለም** “ye (it) are the light of the world” Matt. 5, 14; **አንተ፡ ውእቱ፡ ዒሳው** “thou art Esau” Gen. 27, 21; **አነ፡ ውእቱ** (‘I it’) “it is I” Matt. 14, 27; **አነ፡ ውእቱ፡ አምላክ፡ አብርሃም** “I am the God of Abraham” Gen. 26, 24; 45, 3; [*Kebra Nag.* 43 a 5 sq.]; **አነ፡ ውእቱ፡ መልአክ፡ . . . አነ፡ ውእቱ፡ ሚካኤል** G. Ad. 138, 2—6; [**አነ፡ ይእቲ፡ አቡከ፡ ወእምከ**, *Kebra Nag.* 27 b 11]. But yet instead of the Copula, the Subject-Pronoun may be repeated after the Predicate, *e. g.* **እስመ፡ አነ፡ ኄር፡ አነ** “because I am good” (*lit.* ‘because I, — *i. e.* as regards me, — good I’) Matt. 20, 15, so that the first **አነ** seems to be taken as a Nominative absolute; so too **አንትሙ፡ ኢለባውያን፡ አንትሙ** Matt. 15, 16; Judges 12, 5; **ወዡልነ፡ ደቂቀ፡ ፩ ብእሲ፡ ንሕነ** Gen. 42, 11.

On the other hand the two verbs **ሀለወ** and **ኮነ** have not yet come to be used so frequently as connecting-words between Subject and Predicate. **ሀለወ** has generally its full meaning, “to be present”, “to exist”, “to be”, *e. g.* **እንዘ፡ እንተ፡ ትልህቅ፡ ሀለወት** “so long as an elder (sister) is there” Gen. 29, 26; **እንተ፡ ሀለወት፡ ውስተ፡ ደብረ፡ ከናአን** “which lies in the hill-country of Canaan” Gen. 33, 18; **ሀሎ፡ ወልድ፡ ዝዩ** “there is a lad here” John 6, 9; **ሀዩ፡ ሀሎኩ፡ አነ፡ ማእከሎሙ** “there am I (present) in the midst

Use of
ሀለወ and
ኮነ as
Connecting-
words.

(1) [PRAETORIUS states the rules of Concord here more clearly. He says (*‘Aethiop. Gramm.’* p. 159 sq.): “When the Predicate contains a description or qualification of the Subject, the Pers. Pron. which serves as Copula is usually regulated in Person, Gender and Number by the Subject, and follows the Predicate; . . . but when the attachment of the Predicate seeks to show that two quite well-known things are equivalent to each other, the Pers. Pron. which serves as Copula is usually regulated by the Predicate, and precedes it”. TR.]

of them" Matt. 18, 20. In like manner ከነ has generally the full signification of "becoming", "originating", "happening", "being on the point of" (*future*), *e. g.* Ps. 37, 15; Mark 5, 14; Gen. 29, 36. Farther ከነ standing by itself is equivalent to "it has happened", *i. e.* "it is past" Gen. 38, 23. Both words, however, came to be used also as connecting-words between Subject and Predicate, either because the Predicate had at the same time to be represented as falling within the domain of the Past or Future,—a condition which cannot be expressed distinctly enough by the pronominal connecting-word⁽¹⁾: ወሀሎ : እግዚአብሔር : ምስለ : ዮሴፍ : **ሰብእ : ጳድቃን** "and God was with Joseph" Gen. 39, 2; ወይኩን : ነሱ : ውሉደ : **ሰብእ : ጳድቃን** "and all the sons of men shall be (*future*) righteous" Hen. 10, 21;—or for the purpose of making the Predicate negative (as if that had always to be expressed by—: 'one has not come to be—this or that'): እትየ : ጸገር : ውእቱ : ወአንሰ : ኢኮንኩ : **ጸገረ** "my brother is hairy, while I am not hairy" Gen. 27, 11, 21; 42, 11, 31; Matt. 10, 20; ኢሀሎ : ወልድ : ውስተ : ዐዘቅት "there was no lad (to be found) in the pit" Gen. 37, 30. In all other cases in which the two verbs are employed as connecting-words, they have nearly always another significant, second meaning, *e. g.* **ዘሀለወ : ድልወ** "who is ('stands') ready" 1 Pet. 4, 5; እለ : ሀለወ : ውስተ : ቤት "who were ('present') in the house" Gen. 33, 14; Lev. 10, 7; 21, 12.

(b) Agree-
ment of
Predicate
with Subject
in Gender
and
Number,
when Pre-
dicate is a
full Verb
or an
Adjective.

§ 195. (b) *If the Predicate is a full Verb or an Adjective, it must agree with the Subject in Gender and Number.* All the variations, however, in the treatment of gender and number, which have been described in § 188, are also current here. Thus, Concord in gender and number is most strictly observed, when the Subject is a Personal Noun or Pronoun, *e. g.*, ብፁዓን : አንትሙ "blessed are ye"; ኢላሐዋ : ደናግሊሆሙ "their maidens did not mourn" Ps. 77, 69; እስመ : ብዙኃት : አንስትያሁ Judges 8, 30; ተወልዳ : ሎሙ : አዋልድ : ሠናያት : ወላሕያት Hen. 6, 1. When the

(¹) Although the pronominal Copula is found in use even in such a case: ὁψόμεθα, τί ἔσται τὰ ἐνύπνια αὐτοῦ ወንርአይ : ምንት : ውእቱ : ሕለ ሚሁ Gen. 37, 20; Judges 13, 12. Even without any Copula, sentences are met with, which fall within the domain of the Past or the Future: አመ : ውስተ : ቀዳሕያን : አንተ "when thou wast among the cupbearers" Gen. 40, 13; አይቲ : ማኅደረ : ኃጥአን "where then shall the abode of sinners be?" Hen. 38, 2; Deut. 15, 15.

Subject is a word denoting a thing or a conception, Concord prevails, it is true, in many instances, as in **ይኩኑ ፡ ብርሃኖች** "Let there be lights!" Gen. 1, 14 (for **ብርሃን** is generally masc.); **ይትከሠታ ፡ ኅቡአቲሆሙ ፡ ለጸድቃን** "the secrets of the just shall be revealed" Hen. 38, 3; **ርእያ ፡ አዕይንትየ** "mine eyes saw" Hen. 39, 5; but often too, the Predicate to a Subject, Fem. sing., keeps its own readiest gender (masc.): **ወኮነ ፡ ድቀቱ ፡ ዐቢየ** "and its fall was great" Matt. 7, 27; **ወኮነት ፡ እሳት ፡ ወጠነ ፡ እምቀትረ ፡ ዕለት** G. Ad. 42, 11; **እስመ ፡ ሥዩም ፡ ውስተ ፡ ልቦሙ ፡ እኪት ፡ በኩሉ ፡ ጊዜ** "for wickedness is lodged in their heart at all times" Gen. 8, 21; **ወኮነ ፡ ትዕይንቶሙ ፡ ዐቢየ ፡ ጥቀ** Gen. 50, 9. Sometimes a Predicate in the Plural masc. is attached to a Subject in the Plural fem., as in **ራእያት ፡ ዲቤየ ፡ ወድቁ** "visions fell upon me" Hen. 13, 8; or the plural of the Subject is conceived of as a feminine Noun of Unity, as in **ኅጣውኢሆሙ ፡ ዐብየት** "their sins are great" Gen. 18, 20; or,—which is the most usual case,—the Predicate to a Plural stands in the Singular Masc., and that with especial frequency if it comes first: **ኅለፈ ፡ መዋዕሊሁ** Josh. 23, 1, 2; Ps. 77, 37 (in contrast with Ps. 89, 9); **ወወፅአ ፡ ስሙግቱ** Matt. 4, 24; **ዕፀው ፡ ዘይፈረ** Gen. 1, 11; **ይትሌዐል ፡ አቅርንተ ፡ ጸድቃን** Ps. 74, 10 (although this may also be explained in accordance with § 192, c); **ይኩን ፡ ኅትወ ፡ መታትዊክሙ** Luke 12, 35; **ይትባረክ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ አሕዛብ ፡ ምድር ፡ በእንቲአክ** Gen. 12, 3; [*Kebra Nag.* 4 a 21 *sqq.*]. If, however, several other predicates follow a plural Subject, without the Subject being expressly repeated, the full concord in gender and number is frequently reverted to in their case, instead of the employment of the Sing. Masc. being continued.—Notice thus cases like: **ሶበ ፡ መጽአ ፡ እማንቱ ፡ አባግዕ ፡ ይስተያ ፡ ይፀንሳ** Gen. 30, 38, followed by **ወሶበ ፡ መጽአ ፡ ወስተያ ፡ ፀንሳ** v. 39: or **ውስተ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ሐረግ ፡ ሠረጸ ፡ አዕጺቂሁ ፡ ወአውፅአት ፡** (not **ወአውፅአ ፡**) **አስካለ** Gen. 40, 10; Ex. 16, 22. But, *vice versâ*, collective-words in the Singular number are often associated with a Predicate in the plural⁽¹⁾: **አዕምኡ ፡ ሕዝብየ** "hear ye, my people" Ps. 77, 1; **ቤተ ፡ እስራኤል ፡ ተወከሉ** Ps. 113, 17, 18; **ይትዋረሱ ፡ ዘርእክ** Gen. 22, 17; **ወፅኡ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ሀገር ፡ ይትቀበልዎ** Matt. 8, 34; Mark 1, 33.

If a sentence contains several Subjects connected by copula-

(¹) An analogous form is furnished in the periphrasis for the Article 'n § 172, c: **ኅጢአቶሙ ፡ ለዝንቱ ፡ ሀገር** Gen. 19, 15.

tive particles, the Predicate, when it comes first, may agree either with the first Subject only, or with all of them combined together (as in § 172, c); but, when it comes last, it usually takes the plural, although the singular is also met with in these circumstances: **ገእ፡ አንተ፡ ወብእሲትከ** &c. Gen. 8, 16; **ወወዕአ፡ ኖሃ፡ ወብእሲቱ** &c. Gen. 8, 18; 9, 2; **ወነሥኡ፡ ሴም፡ ወያፌት** Gen. 9, 23; **ወነሥኡ፡ አብራም፡ ወናኮር፡ አንስቲያ፡ ሎሙ** Gen. 11, 29; **ዘእንበለ፡ ይትፈጠር፡ ፀሐይ፡ ወተኣምር** Hen. 48, 3⁽¹⁾; **ሰላም፡ ወርትዕ፡ ሱቱፋኑ፡ ይከውኑ** Hen. 11, 2; **ፍርሀት፡ ወረዓድ፡ ነሥአሙ** Hen. 13, 3; **ሐዘን፡ ወሕማም፡ ወጻማ፡ ወመቅሠፍት፡ ኢይገስሶሙ** Hen. 25, 6⁽¹⁾. In these cases much depends upon the sense: If the first word is the principal Subject, those which follow being subordinate to it in importance, so that **ወ** corresponds rather to our “accompanied by” or “along with”,—as in the cases cited above, Gen. 8, 16, 18, or in **ወሐለየት፡ ዴቦራ፡ ወበረቅ** Judges 5, 1,—then the Predicate usually conforms only to the first of the Subjects, even though all the Subject-Words should denote persons.

Frequently also the Predicate is regulated not by the grammatical, but by the logical Subject of the sentence⁽²⁾, *e. g.* in **ምንትኑ፡ ሕዙናን፡ ገጽካሙ፡ የም** “why is your countenance sad (*pl.*) to-day” Gen. 40, 7; **መኑ፡ ስምክ** “what (*lit.* ‘who’) is thy name?” Gen. 32, 28 (v. § 198); **ይጸርኑ፡ ነፍሳት** “the souls (of men) cry out” Hen. 9, 10.

(c) Arrange-
ment of the
Sentence.

§ 196. (c) As regards *the arrangement of the sentence*, Ethiopic exhibits greater freedom than any other Semitic language. It is capable of expressing almost any Greek sentence, with a pretty exact preservation of its word-arrangement. The entire development of the speech, during a long formative period, aimed at reaching the utmost possible freedom in the structure of the Sentence, and the ability to furnish adequate expression for the manifold forms and shades of thought. For that reason precisely, Prepositions have been formed in rich abundance, and a highly diversified employment of Suffixes has been developed, together

(¹) [In Hen. 48, 3 FLEMMING adopts the variant **ትትፈጠር** instead of **ይትፈጠር**, and in 25, 6, **ወጻዕር** instead of **ወጻማ**. TR.]

(²) So too in the periphrasis of the Article, § 172, c: **ተዘከሮሙ፡ ለነፍሳተ፡ አግባርቲክ** (*Liturg.*); **ዘረዎሙ፡ ለነገረ፡ ዙሉ፡ በሓውርት** Gen. 11, 9.

with the various methods, already described, of expressing Case. Behind these forms and grammatical expedients, however, a certain intellectual and mental energy is found in full vigour, which is able to hold in its grasp extended and seemingly dislocated sentences, and to assign the just relation which members of the sentence hold to each other, though separate and far apart. What form may be given, in accordance therewith, to the arrangement of the words within the individual word-groups of the sentence has already been generally indicated. In what follows we have only to discuss the arrangement of the leading members of the sentence.

(α) In ordinary, unimpassioned discourse, the Predicate stands at the beginning of the sentence: the Subject follows, and then the Object: **ወረከበ : ዮሴፍ : ሞገሰ : በቅድመ : እግዚአ-** Gen. 39, 4. If the Object is a Suff. Pron., it naturally precedes the Subject. When several objects appear, that which is first affected by the action comes before the others. If, however, the Object together with the verb forms only one idea, it is placed before the Subject: **ወወለደት : ወልደ : ይአቲ : ብእሲት** Judges 13, 24; **ወወደየት : አዕይንቲሃ : ላዕለ : ዮሴፍ : ብእሲት : እግዚአ-** Gen. 39, 7. In like manner the Subject is generally put last, when farther qualifications are attached to it, as in **እፎ : ኢይመይጦ : ፍናዊሆ ሙ : ብርሃናት : ዘውስተ : ሰማይ** Hen. 2, 1; or when it has to serve at the same time as the Subject of a (following) relative clause: **አርኅወ : መስኮታ : ለታቦት : ኖኅ : እንት : ገብረ** Gen. 8, 6. The Subject comes regularly before the Predicate, only when the latter is a Substantive (v. several examples in § 193), as well as in secondary clauses, which add the detailed circumstances of the main action, or the condition of a person or thing concerned in that action during its continuance, whether these clauses are joined to the principal clause with **ወ** or without it (Circumstantial Clauses)⁽¹⁾. In this case the person or thing, whose condition and circumstances have to be detailed, is always put at the head of the clause, and is often specially emphasised by an appended **ሰ**, thereby arresting the undivided attention, and checking the onward flow of the narrative; “he brought his present to Eglon, **ወኤግሎምሰ : ቄጢጥ : ብእሲ : ውአቱ : ጥቀ** now Eglon was a man of very refined manners” Judges 3, 17; Hen. 14, 25; “he saw a man standing before

(α) Usual
Order.

(1) V. EWALD, ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 806, b; ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 670.

him, **ወሰደኛ ምሉኅ ውስተ እዴሁ** and a drawn sword (was) in his hand” Josh. 5, 13; Hen. 39, 5; **ሕያው የሴኛ ወልድክ ወው እቱ መልአክ ለብሔረ ግብጽ** Gen. 45, 26; Judges 3, 27; **ነሥኡ ሎሙ አንስተ . . . ስማ ለአሐቴ ያርፋ ወስማ . . .** &c. Ruth 1, 4. Thus too the word **ነዋ** (or **ናሁ**) “lo!”, when it has to point to a definite Subject, attracts this Subject to itself,—its own place being at the head of the clause,—and in this way causes it to precede the Predicate, *e. g.* in Gen. 33, 1; 41, 5; Judges 14, 5, 8; while, if it points rather to the Action than to the Subject, it leaves the original order of the words unaltered, *e. g.* in Judges 20, 40; Hen. 85, 3.

(β) Altera-
tion of
Usual
Order, for
Purposes of
Emphasis.

(β) The usual order of the sentence is broken in upon, whenever any word in it, in conformity with the leaning of the thought, has to be brought into special prominence. The superior importance assigned to the word concerned is generally indicated by its position,—by its being brought to the head of the clause. Thus any word in the clause may be emphasised by being put first. For instance, the emphasis is laid upon the Subject in:—**እግዚአብሔር ወሀበክሙ ስዕለተ ሰንበት** “God (himself) has given you this Sabbath-day” Ex. 16, 29; or—“and it did not stink, **ወዕጼሂ አተፈጥረ በላዕሌሁ** nor was there any worm bred in it” Ex. 16, 24; and upon the Object in:—**ቃለ ሚአሁ ንሰምዕ** “his word will we obey” Josh. 24, 24; **ኀጢአትየ እዜከር የም** “my sin do I remember this day” Gen. 41, 9; **ወዘያፈክር ሊተ ኀጣእኩ** “but one who can interpret to me I have not” Gen. 41, 15; **ዘትግበሩ ሀለወክሙ ግበሩ** “that which you have to do, do” Ex. 16, 23. Or the emphasis rests upon some qualification or other, as in:—**ይሄ ይሰኝ ለክ አሁብ እምነ ለካልእ ብእሰ** “better is it that I give (her) to thee than to another man” Gen. 29, 19; **ላዕሌየ ይኩን መርገምክ** “upon *me* be thy curse!” Gen. 27, 13; **እመሰ ከመዝ ሀለወኝ እኩን** “if it should be *so* with me” Gen. 25, 22; **እምትካትሰ አኮ ከመዝ ዘተገብረ** “in olden time it was not so done” Matt. 19, 8; “they gathered every morning &c., **ወበዕለተ ዐርብ ያስተጋብኡ ካዕበተ ኀምር** but on the Friday they gathered a double measure” Ex. 16, 22; **ሰዱሰ ዕለተ ታስተጋብኡ** “for six days ye shall gather, (but) &c.” Ex. 16, 26.

When a special group of words is employed to form the Subject commencing a sentence, it is generally expressed a second time in a short and emphatic form by means of a Pronoun set im-

mediately before the Predicate:—**ውእቱ : ብእሲ : ዘበላዕሌሁ :**
ተረክበ : ኮራዩ : ውእቱ : ይኩነኒ : ገብረ : ወአንትሙስ (*lit.* “that
 man upon whom shall be found my cup, *he* shall be to me a ser-
 vant, but as for you—&c.”) Gen. 44, 17; **ሚካኤል : ወገብርኤል :**
ሩፋኤል : ወፋትኤል : ውእቶሙ : ያጸንዕዎሙ Hen. 54, 6. An Ac-
 cusative, Dative or Genitive,—put first by way of emphasis,—of
 a word determined by the Article, may, in accordance with § 172, c,
 be indicated periphrastically by **ለ** before the word and a Suff.
 Pron. after the verb or other word which governs it: **ወለዝክቱኒ :**
ሰቀልዎ “and *him* on the other hand they hanged” Gen. 41, 13;
አላ : ለእግዚአብሔር : ትልውዎ “but the Lord do ye follow!”
 Josh. 23, 8; **ወለብእሲትኒ : ይቤላ** “and to the woman in turn he
 said” Gen. 3, 16; **ወሎሙስ : ሠረውዎሙ : ለኩሎሙ** “but them
 indeed they extirpated, one and all” Josh. 11, 14; **እስመ : ለእግዚ.**
አ : መናፍስት : ተርእዮ : ብርሃኑ “for of the Lord of Spirits the
 light appeared” Hen. 38, 4; **ለጸድቃንስ : ሰላመ : ይገብር : ሎሙ**
 Hen. 1, 8⁽¹⁾. But in fact, any word, whatever be the rank it takes
 in the sentence, may be put by way of emphasis at the beginning
 of it, in the form of a Nominative Absolute⁽²⁾; and then it is enough
 to have a reference to it in that part of the sentence which it
 would have occupied, if it had been without emphasis: **አኮኑ : እ**
ሙ : ስማ : ማርያም “is not his mother’s name Mary?” Matt. 13, 55;
ወያዕቆብስ : ሕሠ-ም : ራእዩ “but Jacob’s face was plain-looking”
 Gen. 25, 27; **ወወርቅክሙስ : ካዕባቶ : ንሥኡ : ምስሌክሙ** “but as
 for your money, take ye the double of it with you” Gen. 43, 12;
ውእቱ : ዮሐንስ : ልብሱ : ዘይለብስ : ዘጸጉረ : ገመል Matt. 3, 4; **ወአ**
ንትሙስ : አልቦ : ዘይትቃወመክሙ “but as for you, there is no
 one that can resist you” Josh. 23, 9; **ኩሉ : ዕፅ : ዘኢይፈሪ : ፍሬ :**
ሠናዩ : ይገዝዎዎ Matt. 7, 19; **ልቦ : ዚአሁ : ትፈቅዱ : ታእምርዎ**
 Judith 8, 14. Indeed the referring Suffix itself may in certain cir-
 cumstances be wanting:—**ወኩሉ : ዘርእ : ዘይዘራእ : ዲቤሃ : አሐቲ :**
መስፈርት : ትገብር : እልፈ Hen. 10, 19⁽³⁾.

(1) [FLEMMING leaves out **ሎሙ** here. TR.]

(2) [A Noun, introduced in this way at the head of a Sentence, un-
 conditioned and awaiting the determination of its Case and its character by
 certain governing and defining words which follow, is now described usually
 by the term *absoluter Vorhalt* or *logischer Vorhalt*.]

(3) Cf. also the example given *supra*, (§ 150 *ad fin.*) of a **ከያሁ** placed
 first as an Absolute.

Meanwhile Ethiopic is able to give special prominence to individual words, apart from position, by means of the appended particle **ሰ** (§ 168, 5), *e. g.* **መዋዕለ : ሕይወትየሰ** Gen. 47, 9; **እስመ : መንፈሳውያንሰ** Hen. 15, 7⁽¹⁾; as well as by **ሂ** “even”, **ኒ** “again”, and several other particles of that nature.

In order to give prominence to *Nouns*, the emphatic adjoining of the Pronoun of the third Person is also made use of, or very commonly the periphrasis by means of a Suffix and **ላ**. A careful consideration of every possible case shows that this mode of expression (already described in § 172, *c*) is frequently employed, not only to replace the missing Article, but also to strengthen the emphasis, *e. g.* in **ሐሰ : ሎሙ : ለአግብርቲክ** “far be it from them, thy servants (that they should do this thing)” Gen. 44, 7.

To bring *Verbs* into bolder relief, the process (described in § 181, *b*, *δ*) of adding to their force by means of their own Infinitive is, in particular, turned to account. Now and then the place of the Infinitive is taken by other conceptional words, *e. g.* **ዜና : ዜነ ወ.ኒ : ዙሎ : ዘገበርኪ** “people have told me all that thou hast done” Ruth 2, 11; **ሞተ : ንመውት** “die we must” Judges 13, 22; Hen. 98, 15.

How *Personal and other Pronouns* are emphasised in the Sentence, has already been pointed out in substance in §§ 150 and 148, *a*. Generally speaking, the repetition of the Pronoun also serves to give it additional prominence. When a Suffix Pronoun is attached to a Noun or a Verb, then in order to lend emphasis to it, the corresponding separate Pronoun is generally added thereto, and for the most part also in the same Case which is assigned to the Suff. Pron. in the sentence: **ባርከኒ : ኪያየኒ** “bless me, even me” Gen. 27, 34; **ሀበኒያ : ኪያሃ** “her do thou give me” Gen. 29, 18; **ኪያኪሰ : ያሐይወኪ** “but thee they will save alive” Gen. 12, 12; **ገብአኒ : ሊተሰ : ወርቅየ** “to me has my money been returned” Gen. 42, 28; **ሥጋነ : ዘዚአነ** “our own bodies” Gen. 47, 18; more rarely in the Nominative, as in: — **ይቀድመክ : ተሐምዎ : አንተ** “to thee the right of marriage as nearest kinsman first falls” Ruth 4, 4; **እምአዘከርትክ : አንተ** *Chrest.* p. 42, line 8; **ብየ : አንሰ : ብዙኅ** “I have plenty” Gen. 33, 9. If the Personal Pronoun stands in the Nominative, **ለሊሁ** or some other proper form of this class

(¹) [FLEMMING omits the **ሰ** here. TR.]

(§ 150) is usually put alongside of it: **አነ : ለሊዩ : ፈርዖን** "I am Pharaoh" Gen. 41, 44; **ወወ-እቱ : ለሊሁ : ይኤዝዝክ**. "and he will command thee" Ruth 3, 4. The form **ወ-እቱሂ** is always employed to express the idea "he too", *e. g.* **ወገብረ : ወ-እቱሂ : መብልዐ** "and he too made ready a dish" Gen. 27, 31; and it is used even in the case of the first Person: **ወ-እቱሂ : አነሂ : አያዩድዐክሙ** "neither do I tell you" Matt. 21, 27.

(γ) In this way the emphatic prominence, which has to be given to one member of a sentence, generally furnishes the motive for exchanging the usual arrangement of the words for a different one. But frequently the ranking of several sentences together, or their absorption into one another, also disturbs the regular order. Thus, in particular, any word, which is determined by an extended Relative Clause not admitting of insertion in the main Clause, is placed, whenever it is possible, immediately before this Relative Clause, and consequently at the end of its own proper Clause, independently even of the peculiar arrangements which result from Attraction (§§ 190 and 201). As an example, again, of the arrangement of words in Clauses which have a Verb subordinated in the Infinitive, the following passage from Ex. 16, 28 may serve: **እስከ : ማእዜ : ተአብዩ : ትእዛዛዩ : ሰሚዐ : ወሕግዩ**, where **ትእዛዛዩ** depends proximately indeed upon **ሰሚዐ**, but mediately upon **ተአብዩ**, and therefore is placed between the two. Finally, regard for the cadence and agreeable smoothness of the sentence has also a decisive influence, as, for instance, in **ወናሁ : ሰባዕቱ : ሰዊት : ዐርጉ : እምነ : አሐዱ : ሥርወ : ጎሩያን : ወሠናያን** Gen. 41, 5, — a subject which cannot be adequately examined in detail here, within the space at our disposal. A very favourite practice is to bring together two different Case-forms of one and the same word: **ዕዉር : ለዕዉር : ለእመ : መርሐ** Matt. 15, 14; **እፎ : ይክል : ሰይጣን : ለሰይጣን : አውዕአቶ** Mark. 3, 23; **መብረቅ : መብረቅ : ይወልድ** Hen. 43, 2⁽¹⁾; **ኄራን : ለኄራን : ያዩድዑ : ጽድቀ** Hen. 81, 7 or 81, 8; 83, 4; **ትውልድ : እምትውልድ : ትኤብስ** Hen. 107, 1⁽²⁾.

(γ) Other
Determining
Motives.

⁽¹⁾ [**መብረቅ** is omitted by FLEMMING here, **ሚጠቶሙ** being made the Subject of **ይወልድ**. TR.]

⁽²⁾ [A good example of the influence of Verse on Word-arrangement is given in *Chrest.*, p. 16, last five lines.]

C. SPECIAL KINDS OF SENTENCES.

1. NEGATIVE, INTERROGATIVE AND EXCLAMATORY SENTENCES.

1. Negative Sentences.

§ 197. 1. *Negative Sentences.* — To express Negation, Ethiopic ordinarily makes use of the three words **ኢ**, **ከ** and **ከል**.

(a) With **ኢ**.

(a) Of these Negatives **ኢ** comes most readily to hand and is oftenest used. It may turn an individual word into its contradictory, and then it corresponds frequently to our prefix *un* or *in*, — *e. g.* **ኣትወልድ : ኢኣማሂት** “O unbelieving generation!” Matt. 17, 17; **ኢኣሚኖቶሙ** “their unbelief” Matt. 13, 58; **በኢያእምሮ : መጻሕፍት** “by reason of not knowing the Scriptures” Matt. 22, 29; **በኢያእምሮ** “in ignorance” Gen. 26, 10; **ኢዘምዎ** “freedom from incontinence” (‘chastity’) 2 Peter 1, 6; **በኢሩከቤ** “by non-cohabitation”, *i. e.* “without cohabitation”. In such a case it forms a Compound with the Noun to which it is prefixed⁽¹⁾. **ኢ** is employed much oftener, however, to put an entire sentence in the Negative; and then it must invariably precede the Predicate, its proper position being that of a prefix to the Predicate itself: **ንሕነ : ኢንክል : ሐዊረ** “we cannot go” Gen. 44, 26; **ወወይነ : ወሚሰ : ኢይስተይ** “and of wine or mead he may not drink” Judges 13, 14; **እምኢተመጠወ : እምእደነ : መሥዋዕተነ : ወቀርባነ** “he would not then have accepted from us our sacrifice and our gift” Judges 13, 23⁽²⁾; and so too, in expressing Infinitive clauses in the negative, Matt. 19, 18. When the sentence does not contain a full verb, **ኢ** is usually placed at the head of the sentence, *e. g.* : **ወኢጽንዐ : ሰማይ : ሳሕሁ** “and there was no firmament of heaven above it” Gen. 1, 8; but yet in this class of Negative Sentences, — in accordance with § 194, — the Auxiliary Verb **ኮነ** or **ሀለወ** is usually employed, and then **ኢ** is prefixed thereto, — or the help of **ከል** is called in (*v. infra*). But if the clause contains some individual word, following the Predicate, which has to be denied with special emphasis, the negative is prefixed both to that word

(1) [*Cf.* similar Compounds with *lā* in Assyrian: *ina lā-šimti* “untimely”; *Lā-Bābilū* “Non-Babylonians” &c.]

(2) An exception is furnished in Sir. 30, 19: **ኢእመንቱ : ይበልዑ : ወኢእመንቱ : ያጹንዉ**.

and to the Predicate, *e. g.* ወኢተርፈ : ወኢአሐዱ “and there was not even one left” Judges 4, 16; Hen. 84, 3. If again the individual word which is denied comes before the Predicate, even in this case the Negative is usually repeated: ወኢማሕስዐ : በግዕ : ኢበላ ዕኩ : እምአባግዒክ “not even a young ram of thy flock have I eaten” Gen. 31, 38; ወኢበአሐቲ : ፍፍ : ኦሆ : ኢንብል *Chrest.* p. 76, line 1; ወኢጃዘሥጋ : አልቦ : (not ቦ) ሥልጣን⁽¹⁾ : ከመ : ይግስሶ “and not a single mortal has power to touch it” Hen. 25, 4. The consequence is that in Ethiopic a double Negative is not equivalent to an affirmative. On the contrary it strengthens the negation.

But ኢ is also used as a Prohibitive, by way of subjective negation (= ἕξ, μῆ), and then it is joined to the Subjunctive: ኢት እመኑ “believe (it) not” Matt. 24, 23; ኢትቅትሉ : ነፍሶ “do not kill him” Gen. 37, 21; and in extended sentences it is usually repeated before every fresh verb, *e. g.* Judges 13, 7 (*v.* also *infra*). In like manner it stands in dependent, final Negative-Sentences, with or without ከመ. When ከመ cannot be dispensed with, then ከመ : ኢ has the meaning “that—not”, “lest” (ἵνα) : — ከመ : ኢትባኡ Matt. 26, 41; ከመ : ኢትበል Gen. 14, 23; 26, 7, 29; ከመ : ክልኤክመ : ኢይሀጉል “that you may not both perish” Gen. 27, 45; it may even be rendered sometimes by “there might otherwise”, *e. g.* in ከመ : ኢትርከበኒ : እኢት Gen. 19, 19.

(b) A stronger and at the same time more independent Negative is supplied in አኮ (“(in) no wise”, “not” (§ 162), which often appears too in Interrogative clauses (አኮኑ, አኮሁ), and serves chiefly to deny individual members of a sentence, in which latter case አላ “but” generally stands overagainst it (“not—but—”): አኮ : ለዝ : ትውልድ : አላ “not for this generation, but &c.” Hen. 1, 2; “they will beget giants upon the earth, አኮ : ዘመንፈስ : አላ : ዘሥጋ not spiritual, but sensual” Hen. 106, 17; አኮ : በሰይፍክ : ወአኮ : በቀስትክ Josh. 24, 12; 22, 26, 28; and so, almost always, in abridged or incomplete sentences: ወአኮ : ርሐቅ “but not far away” Hen. 30, 1; “you should petition for men, ወአኮ : ሰብእ : በእንተአክመ but not men for you” Hen. 15, 2; አኮ : ወናይ : አውስቦ “then it is not good to marry” Matt. 19, 10; ባሕቱ : አኮ ኬ : በበዓል “not, however, on the feast-day” Matt. 26, 5; አኮ : መ

(1) [FLEMMING has ሥልጣኑ. TR.]

ፍትው ፡ ይሉሩ “it is not necessary that they go away” Matt. 14, 16 (**ኢመፍትው** would rather mean “unnecessary”⁽¹⁾). Regularly therefore, we have **ወእመ ፡ አኮ** or **ወእመ ፡ አኮሰ** for “and if not” (*e. g.* Gen. 18, 21), without any following verb. Farther, **አኮ** is often employed, when, in a sentence otherwise complete, a single word,—but not the whole sentence,—has to be put in the Negative. Now in this case, if **አኮ** were merely placed before the word concerned, while the rest of the sentence remained unaltered in its structure, the effect of the **አኮ** would be extended over the whole sentence. To meet this difficulty, **አኮ** with the individual word concerned is put at the head of the sentence, and the rest of it is at once interrupted and continued with the help of a relative pronoun (just as in French), *e. g.* **አኮ ፡ ነሉ ፡ ዘያገምር** “not every one comprehends” (‘not every one is it who comprehends’) Matt. 19, 11. On the other hand **አኮ ፡ ነሉ ፡ ያገምር**, even if the expression were a possible one, would mean “not any one comprehends” or “no one comprehends”; **እስመ ፡ አኮ ፡ ንሕነ ፡ ዘአስቆረርናክ** “for we have not abhorred thee” (‘for it is not we who have abhorred thee’) Gen. 26, 29; **እምትካትሰ ፡ አኮ ፡ ከመዝ ፡ ዘተገብረ** “in olden time it was not so done” Matt. 19, 8; **አኮ ፡ በጽድቅ ፡ ዘአምጸእክ** “not in righteousness (‘is it that thou hast brought’) hast thou brought” Gen. 4, 7; **አኮ ፡ በኅብስት ፡ ክመ ፡ ዘየሐዩ ፡ ብእሲ** “not by bread alone (‘is it that man lives’) does man live” Matt. 4, 4; **አኮ ፡ አንትሙ ፡ ዘፈነውክሙኒ** “it was not you that sent me” Gen. 45, 8; so too Gen. 3, 4; Josh. 22, 24; Matt. 7, 21; 16, 11. In the same way even a Verb is put with emphasis in the negative: **አኮ ፡ ዘሞተት ፡ ሕፃን** “by no means (‘is it the case that the child is dead’) is the child dead” Matt. 9, 24; **ሶበ ፡ አኮ ፡ ዘበላዕክ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ ዕፁ** “if thou hast really not eaten of this tree” Gen. 3, 11. And thus **አኮ** may come to be placed even immediately before the Verb, particularly when the Verb may be regarded as standing in an abridged relative or dependent clause: **አኮ ፡ ትትገብኡ ፡ ሀለወክሙ** “not to hide are you obliged”, (literally: ‘not (that) you must conceal yourselves,—is in store for you’) Gen. 104, 5.

(c) With
አልቦ.

(c) The Negative **አልቦ** signifies properly “there is not”, “there does not exist” (§§ 167, 1, *b* and 192, *b*), and can only be

(1) [That is to say, the form with **አኮ** gives a stronger negation = “it is not at all necessary”. TR.]

used when this turn of thought and expression is possible and thinkable. It stands quite independently for “no”,—in opposition to **አወ** “yes”—, in the sense of “it is not the case”, Matt. 5, 37; or in answer to a question, Matt. 13, 29; John 1, 21; or to decline or deprecate a proposal, Ex. 10, 25; Ruth 1, 13; [*Kebra Nag.* 105 a 20]. In sentences, in which a finite verb is wanting, **አል** is used in the meaning “there does not exist”: **ወኢማይ : አል : ላዕሌሁ** “and there is no water above it” Hen. 18, 12; **ወኢጃዘሥጋ : አል : ሥልጣን : ከመ : ይግስሶ** “and there is no power in any mortal to touch it” Hen. 25, 4⁽¹⁾; **አል : ጽድቀ : ውስተ : አፋሆሙ** “there is no righteousness in their mouth” Ps. 5, 10 (Accusative in accordance with § 192, *b*) &c. In the same way (just like **ገሰ**), when placed before a separate Noun, it serves to form Negative Adjectives, *e. g.* **አል : ራሕብ** “not broad” (“narrow”) Hen. 26, 3, and in the Plural **አልን : ራሕብ** Hen. 26, 5 (*lit.* ‘there is not in them any breadth’); **አል : ኑጎ** (‘there is not in it height’) “it is not high” Hen. 26, 4⁽²⁾. Then too, by means of **አል** and a following Relative Pronoun, a periphrasis is formed for “no one” and “nothing” (literally, “there is not who, *or* what”): **አል : ዘይስማዕ : መኑሂ** “no one must hear” Josh. 6, 10; **አል : ዘተርፈ** “no one was left” Josh. 8, 17; **ወከልክ : አል : ዘይትልዎ** “and he forbade any one to follow him” Mark 5, 37; **አል : ዘተሀበኒ** “thou shalt not give me anything” Gen. 30, 31; **ወኮነ : ከመ : ዘአል : ዘሶክ : ውስተ : ከርሦሙ** “and it was as if nothing had entered their stomach” Gen. 41, 21:—and, similarly, **አል : አመ** means (‘there is not, when’) “never”, *e. g.* Judges 19, 30. With a following **ዘ**, **አል** serves to put entire sentences emphatically in the Negative: **አል : ዘትትጋክዙ : በፍኖት** “see that ye fall not out by the way” Gen. 45, 24. On **አልብዩ** &c. “I have not” v. § 176, *h*. In both of its significations—“there is not” and “I have not”—this Negative has often to make up also for Negative Adjectives which are wanting: **ዐዘቅት : ሐዳስ : ወአልባቲ : ማየ** “a new and waterless pit” (liter-

(1) [In both passages FLEMMING has the Accus.: **ማየ** in Hen. 18, 12 and **ሥልጣን** in 25, 4. TR].

(2) [FLEMMING has the Acc. throughout in these three passages, Hen. 26, 3, 4, 5, reading **ርሕብ** in 3 and 5, and **ኑጎ** in 4; similarly he gives the Accus.-reading instead of DILLMANN’s Nom. in the next two passages cited here from ‘Henoch’, viz 39, 6 and 40, 1. TR].

ally: 'and water' it had not') Gen. 37, 24; **አውታር : ሐደስት : እለ :**
አልሞ : ብትከተ "new, undamaged cords (or 'tendons')"
 Judges 16, 7; **ኅሩያን : ጉልቀ : አልሞ** "innumerable elect"
 ('number was not in them') Hen. 39, 6; "I saw tens of thousands,
ወአልሞ : ጉልቀ : ወሐሳብ an innumerable and incalculable multitude"
 ('and there was not in them number or reckoning') Hen. 40, 1;
ወከወወ : ደመ : ገጹላን : ብዙኃን : ዘአል : ጉልቀ "and he shed
 the blood of an infinite number of holy men" *Chronique de Jean*
 (ed. ZOTENBERG), p. 70, l. 4 sq. [Cf., farther, Hen. 103, 10, where
አል is found followed by a pleonastic **ኢ**—: **ወአል : ዘ**— . . .
ኢረከብነ "we have found nobody who . . ."].

(d) Various
 Negative
 Phrases.

(d) The ideas—"nothing" and "no one",—may be expressed
 also by **ኩሉ** accompanied with a Negative, or by **ኢ** with a follow-
 ing **ወኢመኑሂ** or **ወኢምንትኒ** (§ 173), *e. g.* **ኢትብልዒ : ኩሉ : ዘ**
ርኩስ Judges 13, 4 (*cf.* Hen. 93, 14—in a question having a nega-
 tive force); **አል : ዘርእዩ : ወኢመኑሂ** Matt. 17, 8; Josh. 8, 17;
 Hen. 14, 21; **ወከመ : ወኢምንት : ኮነ : ውስተ : እደሁ** "and it was
 as nothing in his hand" Judges 14, 6; **ወኢከመ : ምንት : ኮናኒ** "and
 ('not as anything') as nothing are they to me" Gen. 47, 9; **ወኢከ**
መ : ምንትሂ Sir. 17, 28; **ወኢከመ : ምንት** ὡς οὐδέν Sir. 40, 6; **ወኢ**
በምንትኒ Amos 6, 6; *v.* also § 198. The idea "at all" (*omnino*)
 in Negative sentences is specially expressed, farther, by **ግሙራ**
 (§ 163, 2), *e. g.* **ኢኅደጉ : ሎሙ : ሥጋ : ግሙራ** "they left no flesh
 of them at all remaining" Hen. 90, 4; **ግሙራ : ኢያንብብክሙኑ**
 "have ye never read at all?" Mark 2, 25. *Not even* (*ne—quidem*)
 is expressed by **ኢ—ጥቀ** (inasmuch as **ጥቀ**, § 163, 1, means pro-
 perly—"exactly", and then also—"even", Gen. 44, 8), *e. g.* **ኢነሳ**
ሕክሙ : ጥቀ : እምድኅረ "ye did not even repent afterwards"
 Matt. 21, 32. *Cf.* also **ወኢሂ : ኢይክሎ**⁽¹⁾ οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνανται
 Rom. 8, 7 (PLATT). "Not only" is **አኮ : ከመ**, *e. g.* Matt. 4, 4; [and
 also **ኢ** or **አኮ : ብሕቲቱ**, DILLMANN'S 'Lex. col. 497]. "No
 more", "no farther" may be expressed by **ኢ—እንከ**, *e. g.* **ወኢደ**
ገመ : እንከ Judges 13, 21; Hen. 92, 5. On **እንብዩ** "I cannot" *v.*
 § 162, and on **እንዳኒ** "I know not", *v.* § 163, 3.

For "neither—nor" **ኢ—ወኢ**, or **ወኢ—ወኢ** (*neque—neque*) is always used; and in such cases, when Nouns are con-
 trasted with one another by means of "neither—nor", the negation.

(1) [The second **ኢ** is wanting in PRAETORIUS' reprint of PLATT'S 'N. T.']

must be repeated with the Verb (v. *supra*, a):—**ወኢይከውን : ሎሙ : ምሕረት : ወኢሰላም** “and they shall neither meet with grace nor peace” Hen. 12, 6; **ኢመልአክ : ወኢብእሲ : ኢይትጫጠው** “neither angel nor man receives (it)” Hen. 68, 5; **ወኢአምጣዮ : ወኢዕቦዮ : ኢክህልኩ : ነጽሮ** “neither its extent nor its magnitude could I see” Hen. 21, 7; Luke 9, 3; **ኢይበቀብ : ብርት : ወኢናእክ :**⁽¹⁾ **ኢይበቀብ** Hen. 52, 8; **ከመ : ኢይንሣእ : ኢፈትለ : ወኢቶታነ : አሥአን** Gen. 14, 23. **ወኢ** occurs in this way thirteen times in succession in Judges 1, 27. Cf. also § 206, 1⁽²⁾.

§ 198. 2. *Interrogative Sentences.* In Interrogation the idea, about whose existence or non-existence the questioner desires information, is thrust forward to the head of the sentence; and by the peculiar arrangement of words which is thus effected, conjoined with the character of the accentuation, the form of an interrogation may in this simple way be impressed upon the sentence. Such a simple type of interrogation, however, is of somewhat rare occurrence in Ethiopic, although illustrated in Gen. 26, 9; Matt. 12, 29 (in both passages, introduced by words which often appear in questions). If the use of any interrogative word is avoided, the question is very often introduced by **ቦ : ዘ** “is it the case, that?” [*est-ce que?*], e. g., **ቦ : ዘህለው : ዝየ : ብእሲ** “is any one here?” Judges 4, 20. — But usually recourse is had to regular interrogatives.

2. Interrogative Sentences:
—(a) Independent Interrogation.

(a) The interrogative which is most in use is the enclitic **ኑ** (§ 161, a), through which, however, the interrogative clause receives no definite colouring, seeing that it may be followed equally by an affirmative and by a negative answer:—**ዳገንኑ : አቡካሙ : ዝኩ : አረጋዊ : ወይቤልዎ : ዳገን** “is your father, the old man, well? And they said, ‘he is well’” Gen. 43, 27, 28; **ዘንተኑ : ዝበርከ** “hast thou done *this*?” Gen. 3, 13. It need not be attached always to the first word:—**እምነ : ሰብአ : ዚአነኑ : አንተ : አው : እምነ : ፀርነ** “dost thou belong to our people or to our enemies?” Josh. 5, 13; and farther even **ወ**, and other conjunctions like **እስመ**, may then stand at the head of the sentence:—**ወይክሉኑ : ደቂቁ : ለመርዓዊ : ጸዊመ** Mark 2, 19; **ኑ** may be even repeated, if the sentence consists of several clauses:—**ታማስኖሙኑ : ወኢታሐዩኑ** Gen. 18, 24.

(1) [FLEMMING reads **ወናእክ**. TR.]

(2) **ዘእንበለ** too is always continued by **ወኢ**.

If the force of the interrogation is meant to bear not upon a single word but upon the entire sentence, then **ቦ**, combined with **ኑ**, or **ቦኑ**, (= 'is it the case?') frequently appears at the head of the sentence: **ቦኑ : እብነ : ይሁቦ** "will he give him a stone?" Matt. 7, 9; **ቦኑ : ዐቃቢሁ : አነ : ለእኑዩ** Gen. 4, 9; Josh. 22, 20; or, with still greater fulness, **ቦኑ : ዘ** ('is it the case that . . .?'), e. g. **ቦኑ : ዘብ ከሙ : እኑ** "have ye a brother?" Gen. 43, 7; **ቦኑ : ዘብከ** "hast thou?" Gen. 19, 12; **ቦኑ : ካልአ : ዘንሴፎ** "must we look for another?" Matt. 11, 3 (where **ካልአ** is put before the verb, because it is specially affected by the question).

Negative questions, to which an affirmative answer is expected, may be expressed, it is true, by **ኢ—ኑ**, e. g. **ኢያንብብከሙኑ** "have ye not read?" Mark 2, 25; but yet, instead of that form, we have at command also **አኮኑ**, with or without a following **ዘ**:—**አኮኑ : በእንተ : ራሔል : ተቀንይኩ** "have I not served for Rachel?" Gen. 29, 25; **አኮኑ : አኅዊከ : ውስተ : ሴኬም** Gen. 37, 13; and **አኮኑ** must be employed, when there is no verb in the sentence, or when the verb cannot begin the sentence on account of the emphasis falling upon another word. Even sentences like **አልቦ : ብእሲተ** "there is no woman" may be brought into the interrogative form by attaching **ኑ** to **አልቦ**, or by placing **ቦኑ** before it:—**ቦኑ : አልቦ : ብእሲተ** Judges 14, 3.

The particle **ሁ** (§ 161, *a*) has pretty much the same force as **ኑ**, and is often directly interchanged with it, but, as a rule, it seems to present farther a collateral suggestion of doubt or complete uncertainty or perplexity in the mind of the interrogator, or of the person addressed:—**ይከውንሁ** "is it lawful?" Matt. 19, 3; **ታአምርሁ** "art thou aware?" Matt. 15, 12; **ይቀሥሙሁ : እምአሥዋክ : አስካለ** "do men gather grapes of thorns?" Matt. 7, 16; **አንተሁ : (another reading is አንተኑ) ዘይመጽእ** "art thou he that should come?" Matt. 11, 3. In Ps. 93, 9 it appears in conjunction with **ኑ**:—**ዘተከላሁ : ለእዝን : ኢይሰምዕኑ** "he who planted the ear, shall he not hear?". Like **ኑ** it is also compounded with **አኮ** and **አልቦ**:—**አኮሁ : መጽብሐውያንሂ : ከማሁ : ይገብሩ** Matt. 5, 46; **አኮሁ : ነፍስ : ተዐቢ : እምሲሲት** Matt. 6, 25; **አኮሁ : ሠናዩ : ዘርአ : ዘራእከ** Matt. 13, 27 (*cf.* **አኮኑ** Matt. 5, 47; 6, 26); **አልቦሁ : አመ : አንብብ ከሙ** ('is there not a time when ye have read?') "have ye never read?" Matt. 21, 16.

(b) The Interrogative for the Dependent Question is **እመ**

“whether” or “if”, or **ለእመ** (§ 170, 1), here and there shortened into **እም**, e. g. **ከመ : ይርአይ : እመ : ተነትገ : ማይ : እምነ : ምድር** “to see if the water was abated from off the earth” Gen. 8, 7; **ንግርኒ : ለእመ : ቦቱ : ማኅደረ : ቤተ : አቡኪ : ለነ** “tell me whether there is a lodging for us in thy father’s house” Gen. 24, 23; **ይትዐቀብዎ : ለእመ : ይፈውሱ** “they watched him whether he would heal him” Mark 3, 2:—also strengthened by **ኑ** or **ሁ**:—**እመ : አንተሁ : ክርስቶስ** Matt. 26, 63; **ንርአይ : እመ : ይመጽእኑ : ኤልያስ** 27, 49; **ለእመ : ዳኅናንኑ : አኅዊክ** “whether thy brethren are well” Gen. 37, 14; [**እሴእሎሙ : ለሰብእ : እመቦ : ለእመ : እረከብ** *Contendings of the Apostles* (ed. WALLIS BUDGE, 1899), Ethiop. text, p. 399, l. 11 sq.]

(c) In Disjunctive Interrogation, **አው** “or” (§ 168, 2) is possible, it is true, as e. g. in Josh. 5, 13 and Judges 20, 28; but yet **ወሚመ** is usually employed instead of it, in independent clauses (§ 161, a), e. g. **ወሚመ : ኢየሱስሃ** “or Jesus?” Matt. 27, 17; **እምኅብ : ውሉዶሙኑ : ወሚመ : እምኅብ : ነኪር** 17, 25. An additional **ኑ** may also be appended to some later word in the disjunctive interrogation: **እምሰማይኑ : ወሚመ : እምሰብእኑ** Matt. 21, 25; **አንተኑአ : ዘይመጽእ : ወሚመ : ቦኑ : ካልእ : ዘንሴፎ** “art thou he that should come, or is there another for whom we are to look?” Luke 7, 19 (—in the corresponding passage in Matt. 11, 3, we have **ወቦኑ : ካልእ**). In Dependent Disjunctive Interrogation, **ወእመ** or **ወለእመ** is commonly used: **እርአይ : ለእመ : በከመ : ጽራኖሙ : . . . ይፈጽምዎ : ወእመ : አኮሰ : አአምር** Gen. 18, 21; **ለእመ : አንተኑ : ውእቱ : ሄሳው : ወለእመ : ኢኮንከ** Gen. 27, 21; **እመ : ይሄርሐ : እግዚአብሔር : ፍኖቶ : ወለእመሂ : አልቦ** Gen. 24, 21. The phrase “or not”, coming after “whether . . .”, in such dependent interrogations, is expressed by **ወእመ : አልቦ**, Judges 2, 22; Hen. 89, 63. [A somewhat peculiar use of **ወኢእመ**, to introduce an alternative suggestion, is met with in the passage:—**ነደደ : ልቡ : ለንጉሥ : በፍቅረ : ዚአከ : እንዳሂ : ዘያአምር : ለሊሁ : እመ : ወልዱ : አንተ : ወኢእመ : እኑሁ : አንተ** “the king’s heart is filled with love for thee, that he may learn whether thou be (really) his son, or (perhaps) his brother” *Kebra Nag.* p. 30 b 21]. To this class of sentences belongs also the passage **ምንት : ይቀልል : እምብሂለ : . . . ወእምብሂለ** Matt. 9, 5; Mark 2, 9 (where **እም** stands for **እመ**, cf. § 170, 2, and the Acc. occurs in accordance with § 182, a, α).

(d) In order to give an additional and special shade of meaning to an interrogation, use is made of other particles, such as **መ**,

(d) **Strengthening-Particles in Interrogation, and Particles of Reply.** which has been treated of already (§ 162, *ad fin.*), or **እንጋ ልዩ**, “indeed?” “really?” (§ 169, 3). **ዮጊ** also (§ 169, 10) may introduce questions denoting perplexity, which are the issue and expression of misgiving, *e. g.* **ዮጊ : ብእሲትከ : ይእቲ** “is she then thy wife?” Gen. 26, 9. The affix **ሰ** is also applied, but merely to lend force and emphasis to the interrogation: — **አሐቲኑ : ከመ : ለከሰ : በረከትከ : አባ** “is there then only *one* blessing of thine, O father?” Gen. 27, 38.

እወ stands for “yea”, “yes”, as a reply in the affirmative, and **አልቦ** for “nay”, “no”, as the negative reply, *e. g.* Judges 4, 20. If, however, the question contains a request, **አሆ** is employed to express consent, and **እንብዩ** to indicate refusal, or else the leading word in the interrogative sentence, to which has been assigned an emphatic position in the question,—is repeated, *e. g.* Gen. 43, 28; Judges 13, 11; Matt. 16, 13, 14.

(e) **Definite Interrogative Words:**

መኑ, *person*. No doubt we meet with the phrase **መኑ : ስምከ** “what is thy name?” Gen. 32, 28; Mark 5, 9; Judges 13, 17 (like **ጥጥህ ሳኔ**), but that is simply because the meaning is:—“who art thou by name?”. **መኑ** has an Accusative form, but takes no Plural (§ 147, *b*). It may follow a Constr. St. as a Genitive:—**ወለተ : መኑ : አንቲ** “whose daughter art thou?” Gen. 24, 23; Matt. 22, 42; **በመባሐተ : መኑ** “by whose authority?” Matt. 21, 23; or the Genitive relation may be indicated by **ዘመኑ**, as in Hen. 22, 6, and in **እንተ : መኑ : ዛቲ : ወለት** “whose damsel is this?” Ruth 2, 5. So too the Dative relation may be signified by **ለመኑ**, *e. g.* Matt. 22, 28. And with all the other prepositions also **መኑ** may be combined:—**እምንበ : መኑ** “from whom?” Matt. 17, 25; **በእንተ : መኑ** “for whose sake?” Hen. 21, 5 &c. Its usual position is at the head of the clause; but if the emphasis happen to fall upon another word in the clause, that word may precede it: **እሎንተ : መባዕላተ : ለመኑ : ያስተዳል ውዋው** “these instruments—for whom are they preparing them?” Hen. 53, 4; **ዝመንፈስ : ዘመኑ : ውእቱ** “this spirit here—to whom does it belong?” Hen. 22, 6. The combination “whoever?” (“who at any place?”, “who at any time?”) may be expressed by the periphrasis “who is he at all that?” &c., *e. g.* **መኑ : ውእቱ : ኩሉ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ : ዘይክል** “what man soever would be able?” (“where is there at all a son of man who could . . .”) Hen. 93, 11.

The corresponding Neuter Interrogative **ምንት** (§ 147, *b*) is very often made use of, when the enquiry is about *things*. It may take an Accusative form, combine with prepositions, and take the same positions in the sentence as **መኑ**, *e. g.* **ዝንቱ : ምንት : ውእቱ** “what is this?” Hen. 23, 3. Notice the phrase **ምንተ : ኮንኪ** (‘what hast thou (*f.*) come to?’) “what is troubling thee?” Judges 1, 14. Although at first employed merely as a Substantive, it may yet take to itself, in an appositional relation, Substantives as well as Adjectives:—**በእንተ : ምንት : ራእይ** “by reason of what vision?” Hen. 60, 5; ⁽¹⁾ **ምንተ : ዐስበ : በክሙ** “what reward have ye?” Matt. 5, 46; **ምንተ : እኩየ** “what evil?” Matt. 27, 23. As **ምንት** virtually includes a predicate, it may, like Verbs of Being, assume a Suffix in the capacity of a Dative (§ 178): **ምንትከ : እሉ** “what are these to thee?” (‘for what to thee, these?’) Gen. 48, 8; **ምንትከ : ውእቱ : ዝንቱ : ነሉ** (‘what is to thee &c?’) “what meanest thou by all this?” Gen. 33, 8. Besides, a Dative of this kind, formed by **ለ** may also be applied for the purpose of adding to the force of a statement: **ለምንት : ለከ : ትሴአል** “wherefore dost thou ask (for thee)?” Gen. 32, 30; Numb. 14, 41; [*cf.* also *Kebra Nag.* 107 b 14, 16: **ምንትከ : ይእቲ : ዛቲ** *quae (tibi) haec est?*, **ምንትኪ : ውእቱዝ** *quis (tibi) hic est?*].

ምንት often takes the interrogative affix **ኑ**, *e. g.* **ምንትኑ : ጌር** “what is the good thing (&c.)?” Matt. 19, 16. Farther, a Verb is often associated as predicate with **መኑ** as well as with **ምንት**, not directly, but by the intervention of the relative pronoun: **ምንት : ዘተርፈኒ** (‘what is there which is left for me?’) “what remains for me?” Matt. 19, 20; **መኑ : ዘይደልዎ** (‘who is there that is worthy of it?’) “who is worthy of it?” Matt. 10, 11. Both interrogatives may stand equally in a direct and in an indirect interrogation, and may be rendered indefinite by affixing **ሂ** or **ኒ**, or in Negative sentences by farther placing **ወኢ** before the interrogative (§§ 147, *b*; 197 *d*); and then **ኢምንትኒ** may be combined with appositional Substantives and Adjectives, just like the interrogative **ምንት**, *e. g.* **ኢትግበሩ : ምንተኒ : ዐመፃ** Gen. 19, 8; **ወኢምንተኒ : ቃለ** “not any word” Hen. 14, 7; **ካልእ : ምንትኒ** “any other thing” Hen. 78, 17.

(¹) [FLEMMING’S reading here is **ምንተ : ራእየ**, without the preposition. TR.]

On **ሚ** v. § 147, *b*, and on **አይ**, § 147, *c*.

On **አይቲ** “where?”, **እፎ** “how?”, **ማእዜ** “when?” and **ምንት**, **ምንተ**, **ለምንት** “why?” *cf.* § 161, *a*. **እፎ** also stands frequently as a separate particle, in the same way as the other Interrogatives, and is followed by **ዘ** or **ከመ**, *e. g.* **እፎ : ከመ : እኪተ : ትፈድየኒ** “how comes it that ye requite me with evil?” Gen. 44, 4; **እፎ : ዘኢትሉብወ** “how is it that ye do not understand?” Matt. 16, 11.

On **ሚመን** “how much?”, “how many?”, “how great?”, and **ስፍነ** and **እስፍንቱ** “how much?”, “how many?”, “how often?” v. § 157, 1.

Two or more independent Interrogatives, of different signification, may be strung together, even without **ወ**, *e. g.* **እፎ : ምንት : ትትናገሩ** : πῶς ἤ τι λαλήσῃτε Matt. 10, 19.

3. Exclamatory Sentences:—
(a) With a single Noun.

§ 199. 3. *Exclamatory Sentences.* (a) In the Exclamation a single Noun may appear, detached and uninflected, *e. g.* **ዳገን : ትብሉ** “blameless! say ye” Matt. 23, 18; **ሠናይ** “well!” Ruth 3, 13; **ሰላም : እብል** : **ለማርያም** “Hail! say I to Mary”; **ሕይወተ : ፈርዖን** “Life of Pharaoh!” *i. e.* “by the life of Pharaoh!” Gen. 42, 15, 16. In fact the Vocative (§ 142) is nothing other than a word uttered singly in this way as an exclamation. Such Vocative may also be preceded by the pronoun of the 2nd Pers.: **አንተ : እኅዩ** “thou! my brother!” and **አንተ : እግዚእየ** “thou! my lord!” Gen. 33, 9, 14. On **አባ** “Father!” *cf. supra* § 142.

(b) With the Imperative in Affirmative Charges, and the Subjunctive in Prohibitions.

(b) The Verb in an Exclamatory sentence, and in an affirmative charge, appears in the Imperative; but with a negative it takes the Subjunctive, *e. g.* **ተምዑ : ወኢተክብሱ** “be ye angry, but sin not” Ps. 4, 5; Eph. 4, 26; **ኢትትንሕለው : ላቲ** Sir. 41, 21. If one incites himself or gives a command to another, then **ለ** makes its appearance, followed immediately by the Subjunctive: **እምይ እዜሰ : ለእሙት : እንከ** “now would I willingly die!” Gen. 46, 30; **ርጉመ : ለይኩን : መዐቶመ** “cursed be their anger!” Gen. 49, 7; **ለይኩን : ብርሃን** Gen. 1, 3; **ውእቱ : ለይዕቀብ : ርእሰኪ** Gen. 3, 15; **ለይፈጽም** “let him do it!” Matt. 19, 12; **ለትደምስሰ** Gen. 17, 14; **ጊጉየ : ለእኩን : ላዕሌከ** Gen. 44, 32. If the sentence has two or more verbs in it, **ለ** either stands with the first alone, Gen. 9, 27, or with more than one, Ruth 1, 17. In Negative clauses **ለኢ** is not the form which is used, because **ለ** would be separated by **ኢ** from the Verb, but on the contrary **ከመ : ኢ**, Judges 21, 1. Yet it is not absolutely necessary that this Subjunctive be introduced by

ለ or **ከመ**: *e. g.* we have **ያውስብ** Matt. 22, 24; **ይቅትልዎ** Matt. 26, 66; Gen. 9, 26; Ruth 4, 11; Ps. 102, 1, 2; **እግዚአብሔር**: **ይዕቀብከ**: **እምነሉ**: **እኩይ** Ps. 120, 7; and v. 5; **ይኩን**: **ለነ**: **ንጉሠ**: **መሲሐዌ**: **በዛቲ**: **ሀገር** “let us have a Christian emperor in this city!” *Chronique de Jean*, p. 183, l. 19 sq. [**እትፈነው** “I will go” *Kebra Nag.* 113 b 1 var.]. **ነኝ** is often employed as a hortatory particle, *e. g.* **ንዑ**: **ንንድቅ** Gen. 11, 4, 7; **ቤተ**: **ክርስቲያኑ**: **ለአትናቲዎስ**: **ሐዋርያዊ**: **ውዕየት**: **በእሳት**: **ንዑ**: **ርድኡነ**: **ኩልክሙ**: **ክርስቲያን** “the church of the apostolic Athanasius is in flames! come and help us, all ye Christians!” *Chronique de Jean*, p. 116, l. 5 sq.; and it may even appear independently: **ንጂ**: **ዝየ** “come thou hither!” Ruth 2, 14 (v. § 160, a). In the case of a strict and very emphatic command, to which no opposition is expected, the Imperfect appears, instead of the Imperative or the Subjunctive: it is, for instance, of very frequent occurrence in the ordinances of the Pentateuch. Infinitives are rarely met with in Exclamatory sentences:—there is, to be sure, the saying of common life: **ዘኮነ**: **ከዊኖ** “what has happened,—its happening (be to it)!”, that is “it is a thing finished”. **ኮንዩ** too, 3 Kings 19, 4 “enough!” (‘I have had enough’)—is manifestly an old Infinitive form with a Suffix: “sufficiency for me!”; for **ኮነ** sometimes signifies “it is enough” Deut. 2, 3; 3, 26; Numb. 16, 3.

(c) Entire sentences even, unfurnished with a Verb (§ 193 sq.), may form the Exclamation. In these, as a rule, the predicate comes first, and the copula,—between subject and predicate,—is wanting⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* **ስብሐት**: **ለእግዚአብሔር** “praise (be) to God!”; **ሰላም**: **ለከ** “peace (be) unto thee!” Judges 6, 23; **እግዚአብሔር**: **ምስሌክሙ** “God (be) with you!” Ruth 2, 4; **ቡሩክ**: **ዘይመጽእ**: **በስመ**: **እግዚአብሔር** Matt. 21, 9; 23, 39; Hen. 9, 4; **ቅዱስ**: **ቅዱስ**: **እግዚአ**: **መናፍስት** “Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Spirits!” Hen. 39, 12; **ኅብ**: **ምትኪ**: **ምግባኢኪ** “for thy husband be thy desire!” (*lit.* ‘to thy husband be thy recurring!’) Gen. 3, 16. Hence the oath-formula: **ሕያው**: **አነ**: **ወሕያው**: **ስምዩ** Numb. 14, 21, 28 (—in the latter verse the last two words are omitted,

(c) Entire Sentences forming the Exclamation.

⁽¹⁾ In Hen. 22, 14 **ውእቱ** is the Subject. [Besides other slight differences which FLEMMING’s reading of this verse exhibits, as compared with DILLMANN’s, this **ውእቱ** is left out. TR.]

but **አመ : አኮ** are added—); Deut. 32, 40; **ሕያው : አነ : ወጽኑዕ :** (read **ወጽኑዕ :**) **መንግሥትየ** Judith 2, 12; **ሕያው : እግዚአብሔር** (followed by **ከመ**) Judges 8, 19; Ruth 3, 13.

(d) Special
Words in
Exclama-
tion.

(d) Of special words in Exclamation we have **ባሐ** “Hail!”⁽¹⁾, — an Accusative, it would seem, 2 John, 10; **ባሐ : ረቢ** “Hail! Master!” Matt. 26, 49; **ባሐ : ንጉሠ : አይሁድ** “Hail! King of the Jews!” Matt. 27, 29; and even with Suffixes: **ባሕክን** “Hail to you! (*f. pl.*)” **χαίρετε**, Matt. 28, 9. The opposite expression is **ወይ** or **አሌ** “Woe!”, varied by **ሰይል**⁽²⁾ “Woe! Ah!” (§§ 61 and 167, 1, a). The first two of these words are always followed by **ላ**, *e. g.* **ወይለኪ** or **አሌ : ለኪ** Matt. 11, 21; **አሌ : ለከመ** Matt. 23, 13 *sqq.*; [*Kebra Nag.* 67 b 4 *sqq.*]; but **ሰይል** invariably takes a Suffix, *e. g.* **ሴልየ** “Woe is me!” Ps. 119, 5. To ward off anything, or protest against or deprecate anything, **ሐሰ** (**ሓሰ**), § 163, 3, is made use of, either in an isolated position: **ሐሰ : እግዚአ : ኢትግበር : ዘንተ : ነገረ** Gen. 18, 25, or more frequently, followed by a Dative: **ሐሰ : ሊተ : እግዚአ** “be it far from me, Lord!” Acts 10, 14; **ሐሰ : ለከ : እግዚአ** Matt. 16, 22; **ሐሰ : ለነ** Josh. 22, 29; **ሐሰ : ሎመ** Gen. 44, 7. If a Verb has to be attached thereto, it is subordinated either by means of the Subjunctive: — Matt. 16, 22; Judges 19, 23; Gen. 18, 25; or by means of **እስከ** and the Imperfect: — **ሐሰ : ለነ : እስከ : ነገድግ** “be it far from us to forsake . . .!” Josh. 22, 29; 24, 16; **ሐሰ : ሊተ : እስከ : እገብር : ለዝንቱ : ነገር** Gen. 44, 17. To strengthen the Imperative, **ሶ** and **እስከ** (§ 162) are used; also, **ብቀዑኒ** (§ 163, 3), *e. g.* **ብቀዑኒ : ሊቅ : ርኢ** “I beseech thee, Master, look . . .!” Luke 9, 38; **ብቀዑኒ : እግዚአ : አብሐኒ** “O my lord, suffer me, I beseech thee, to . . .!” Gen. 44, 18; and in the plural **ብቀዑኒ** 2 Cor. 10, 1; **ብቀዑኒ : አጋእስትየ** “my lords, I pray you . . .!” Gen. 19, 18. An Interjection of joy as well as of derision is met with in **እንቋዕ** “bravo!”, v. § 162.

(e) Optative
Expressions.

(e) The Verb may likewise be put in the Subjunctive to express a *Wish*, but the Perfect also may be employed, just as in Conditional Clauses (§ 205) which are allied to Optative ones: **ረከብኩ : ጸጋ : በቅድሜክ** *εὔρωμι* Gen. 34, 11; Ruth 2, 13; **ይሁዳ : ሰብሐክ : አገዊክ** *αἰνέσασαι* Gen. 49, 8; Sir. 36, 4; Tob. 11, 16.

(1) Corresponding to the Arabic **هَيْ**, and, as regards its origin, still obscure.

(2) The ground-form seems to be **ሰይ**.

እመ “if!” and **እም** (§ 170) are words specially used to introduce Optative clauses, *e. g.* **እምነሣእከ** *si sumpsisses = debebas sumere* Matt. 25, 27; [**ባሕቱ : እምቀደምከ : ነሢአ** “if thou only hadst taken” *Kebra Nag.* 66 b 2; so also **ባሕቱ** in *Annal. Joh. I.* (GUIDI), p. 3, l. 10; p. 6, l. 24 sq.], as well as the conjunction **ሶበ** “when”, which is used, like **ኣኒ**, for “would that!”; **ሶበ : ሞትነ** “would that we had died!” Ex. 16, 3; **ሶበ : ኅደርነ : ወነበርነ** “would that we had remained!” Josh. 7, 7. Farther, a *Wish* may be introduced even by the interrogatives “who? what? when? where? how?”:—**መኑ : ወመበነ : ዕረፍቱ** “O that one would give us rest!” Hen. 63, 5; **መኑ : ይሁበኒ** “O that one would give me!” Hen. 95, 1; also with **እም** = *ፈላ* prefixed to the verb: **መኑ : እምከፈለኒ** “O that one would assign to me!”; (*cf.* 2 Kings 15, 4); or with **እመ** (*v. supra*): **መኑ : እመ : አግብአ : ለዝክቱ : ሕዝብ : ውስተ : እደዩ** “O that one would give this people into my hand!” Judges 9, 29; Numb. 11, 29.

(f) For “how!” “how very—!” occurring in Exclamatory utterances, **ሚ** (§ 147, *b*) is employed, *e. g.* **ሚአዳም** “how charming!” Cant. 4, 10; and also **እፎ** (§ 161, *a*) and even **ከመ**, *e. g.* **ከመ : ሠናይ : ወፍሠሕ : ርእየቱ** “how fair and pleasing is its appearance!” Hen. 32, 5. The expression of enhancement “how much more!” is rendered by **እፎ : ፈደፋደ** (§ 161, *a*); for “how much less!” **እፎ** or **እፎኬ** “how then!” may also be used: “our money even we have brought back, **ወእፎኬ : ንሰርቅ : እምቤትከ : ወርቀ** how much less would we steal money out of thy house!” Gen. 44, 8.

(f) Various
Exclama-
tory
Particles.

2. CONNECTED SENTENCES.

(a) COPULATIVE CLAUSES.

§ 200. 1. The conjunction **ወ** or the enclitic **ኒ** “also” (§ 168, 3) serves to join together words, or it may be clauses, into a series. The particular discourse may be continued, it is true, by merely placing two or more of its members side by side as co-ordinates, and without the intervention, in their case, of connecting particles, *e. g.* **ለዑል : ዐቢይ : ወቅዱስ** Hen. 10, 1; 15, 4; but this is an unusual proceeding; even in numerical statements the individual numbers are united by special particles. If a word or a clause has not only to be connected with a preceding one, but to be emphasised at the same time as fresh material, the arrangement

1. Copula-
tive use of
ወ and
እንከ and
some other
Particles.

ወ—ኒ or **ወ—ኒ** (§ 168, 3, 4) is made use of, and may often, in certain circumstances, be repeated.—If an additional Noun has to be connected with a Noun which has not been expressly mentioned, but has merely been indicated in the Verb or in a Pron. Suff., the Noun which has been thus previously indicated is again brought under notice by means of a separate Personal Pronoun, placed directly before the new Noun, as in **ከመ : ይንበር : ወ-እቱ : ወ-በእ ሲቱ : ወደቂቁ** Ruth 1, 1; Judges 19, 9; Matt. 25, 9. A Verb, Adjective or Pronoun which is referable to two or more Nouns connected by “and”, and precedes the series, may either take the Gender and Number of the nearest and most important one merely, or of the whole series, the Masculine Gender being taken by preference when the members of the series are of more genders than one, *e. g.* **ወወረደ : ሶምሶን : ወአቡሁ : ወእመ** Judges 14, 5; **ወነገሮመ : ለአቡሁ : ወለእመ** Judges 14, 2 (*v.* also § 172, *c*).—When, however, the Verb, Adjective or Pronoun follows the series, it must, as a rule, take the Plural. On the other hand one and the same Noun may become the Object of two or more Verbs connected by **ወ**. In such a case, if the second Verb comes after the Object, it usually repeats and assumes it in the form of a Suff. Pron.;—*v.*, however, as an exception **ለምንትነ : ኀደገ : ዓለመ : ወመነንከ** (not **ወ መነንከ**) *Chrest.* p. 45, line 21 *sq.*

In Ethiopic, the most general connecting particle,—*viz.* **ወ**,—suffices to join clauses together, even in those cases in which other languages, more accurate in their expression of logical relations, make use of other uniting-words or particles. **ወ** is the usual equivalent in Ethiopic for the Greek particle of continuation **δέ**, and in many cases it serves to indicate even the adversative “but”, *e. g.* Matt. 7, 3; 16, 26; only, when some individual idea in the attached sentence has to be contrasted with an individual idea in the preceding one, the form **ሰ**, or still more frequently **ወ—ሰ** (§ 168, 5), is employed. An Infinitive even may be continued by a finite Verb, as in **ኀዲጎ : እግዚአ : ወተለወከ** *Chrest.* p. 42, line 9 *sq.*; Eccl. 8, 16; and, conversely, a finite Verb may be continued by an Infinitive, *e. g.* **በእንተ : ዘሰማሐከኒ : ሊተ : ወተዐድዎትከ : ለአምላክከ** G. Ad. 57, 9; **እንዘ : የኀሥሥ : ይቅተሎ : ወምጽአቶ : እምላቅ ለ : ገጸ : ምድር** *ibid.* 78, 24. *Circumstantial Clauses* ⁽¹⁾ also, which

(1) *V.* on this subject EWALD, ‘*Gr. Ar.*’ § 670; ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’, § 306, *c* and § 341.

are thrown in, as the discourse proceeds, for the purpose of describing more minutely some object, circumstance or situation previously mentioned,—are in like manner attached to the principal clauses by **ወ**, *e. g.* **ቦተ : ኢየሱስ : ወቤተ : ጎረ : ምኑሩ** ἤλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν Ἰούστου, οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ Acts 18, 7. In these Descriptive Clauses, however,—as has already been pointed out in § 196, *c, α*—, the Subject must, as a rule, come first, and usually it has additional prominence given it by the attachment of the affix **ሰ**, *e. g.* “the angels came to Sodom in the evening, **ወሎጥሰ : ሀሎ : ይነበር : ውስተ : አንቀጽ** as Lot was sitting within the gate” Gen. 19, 1; 20, 4; 21, 5; 24, 62; Numb. 22, 22; Judges 13, 2. Still, Descriptive Clauses of this kind, introduced by **ወ**, are not nearly so common in Ethiopic as in Arabic. Much more frequently Ethiopic makes use of the conjunction **እንዘ** (§ 170, 5) to introduce Clauses of Circumstance, *e. g.* Gen. 18, 1; Judges 8, 11; Ex. 12, 11; Hen. 32, 3. But even without **እንዘ** or **ወ**, and merely in asyndetic apposition, a circumstantial clause may be added to the principal clause: *cf.* § 189, 3, *c*, and cases like **ወአነ : ሀለውኩ : እስከ : ዝንቱ : ዲበ : ገጽዮ : ግልበቤ** Hen. 14, 24; **ወነበርነ : ውስተ : ገዳም : ኢያቀረረነ : ክረምት : ወኢያህበነ : ሐጋይ** *Chrest.* p. 31, line 17 *sq.*—Finally, **ወ** is largely employed in Ethiopic to connect together clauses which stand related to one another in *Temporal* or *Logical Sequence*. No special *Waw consecutivum* is known in Ethiopic, such as we have in Hebrew, nor even a **و** as distinguished from **وَ**,—such as occurs in Arabic. Both in narrative diction and in the prophetic style, the individual propositions must always be strung together by the same connecting particle **ወ**; and if the succession in time or thought has to be indicated with greater exactness, this must be effected by the addition of special particles like **ወእምዝ** “and then” Judges 16, 25; 19, 8; or **ወ—እንከ** (§ 169, 2). And yet there can be no doubt that this **ወ**, although it is undistinguishable, in pronunciation or form, from the common connecting particle **ወ**, carries with it very often a more forcible signification than the latter. Coming after temporal or conditional clauses,—the apodosis of which is usually annexed to the protasis without the interposition of any Conjunction,—this **ወ** may with special effect take its place at the head of the apodosis, *e. g.* **ወሶበ : ይኔጽር : ወይሬኡ** “and when he looks,

then he sees" Gen. 29, 2; "if he brings me back again . . . safe and sound, **ወይከውኒኒ : . . . አምላኪያ** then shall he be to me my God" Gen. 28, 20 *sq.* ⁽¹⁾; and similarly after a question: **ሚመጠነ : ትሁቡኒ : ወአነ : ለክሙ : አጉብአ** "how much will ye give me? so shall I deliver him up to you" Matt. 26, 15. When, farther, subsidiary qualifications precede the principal clause, **ወ** is often used to introduce effectively the principal clause itself, *e. g.*—**እስመ : ዓዲ : ስቡዕ : መዋዕል : ወአመጽእ** "for there are yet seven days, and then will I bring" Gen. 7, 4 ⁽²⁾. Lastly, two actions, of which the first is the condition and premise of the second, may be connected by this more significant **ወ**, *e. g.*:—"I have heard say of thee **ከመ : ሰማዕከ : ሕልመ : ወፈከርከ** that thou requirest merely to hear a dream, in order to interpret it at once" (*lit.* 'that thou hearest a dream and dost interpret'—*ἀκούσαντά σε ἐνύπνια συγκρίναι αὐτά*) Gen. 41, 15.—**ወ** is very often employed with a following Subjunctive, to supply the result contemplated in a foregoing action, especially after a summons: **ተጋብኡ : ወአይድዕከሙ** "gather yourselves together, that I may tell you, *or* then will I tell you" Gen. 49, 1; Deut. 32, 1; Judges 14, 13; Ps. 49, 8; 80, 8; or after requests, *e. g.* Matt. 26, 53. In the same way a Wish or Command,—which is derived, like a consequence, from a foregoing transaction,—is associated with the foregoing clause by **ወ** followed by an Imperative or Subjunctive, *e. g.* "this time too hast thou told me lies, **ወአይድዕኒ** now tell me truly" (*ἀνάγγειλον ὃν μοι*) Judges 16, 13; "Who has given you permission to practise hatred? **ወይርከብከሙ : ለኃጥአን : ኩነኔ** May doom therefore light upon you sinning ones!" Hen. 95, 2 ⁽³⁾.

But while Ethiopic may in this way employ the particle **ወ**, invested with a special significance, to indicate various relations, it has at command in most cases farther particles and Conjunctions, which express these relations still more definitely. Accordingly

(¹) [V. also, *infra*, p. 544, Note (¹); and *cf.* *Kebra Nag., Introd.* p. XIX.]

(²) In other cases the same end is attained by asyndetic apposition: **ስኩብ : ኮንኩ : ባቤተ : መላልኤል : እምሔውየ : ርኢኩ : በራእይ . . .** "I was sleeping in the house of my grandfather Malāle'el (and then) I saw in a vision . . ." Hen. 83, 3.

(³) [FLEMMING reads the Indic. here, **ወይርከብከሙ** and not the Subj. TR.]

Hen.		Hen.		Hen.	
14, 2	431	26, 4	436, 511	52, 2	170
4	356	5	393, 426, 511	3	334, 499
6	169, 226, 292	27, 5	543	4	446
7	517	28, 2	377, 393, 398 <i>bis</i> , 412, 554, 555	5	432
10, 11	496	29, 2	471	7	266, 494
12	534	30, 1	509	8	513
15	473	31, 3	433	9	170
18	426	32, 2	398, 402, 480	58, 3	315, 316
19	401, 426, 491	3	478, 485, 523	4	315, 316, 516
21	456 <i>bis</i> , 512	5	521	6	245
22	461	6	295, 360, 480	7	447
24	523	33, 2	380	54, 5	438
25	483, 503	3	533	6	447, 505
15, 1	480	34, 2	374, 484	55, 3	539
2	509	36, 4	478	4	171
3	480	37, 3	329, 455	56, 1	229, 493
4	336, 521	4	495	2	331
5	397, 398	5	407	4	473
6	463	38, 2	500	5	395
7	413, 506	3	501	7	398
11	33	4	377, 505	8	357
16, 1	380	6	343, 377	57, 2	494
3	413	39, 5	501, 504	58, 3	493
4	415	6	511, 512	5	540
17, 1	380	8	456	59, 1	391
4	534	9	433	2	299, 418
7	328	10	447	60, 1	490
8	357	11	493	5	517
18, 4	445	12	519	7, 8	285
6	535	40, 1	368, 372, 511, 512	61, 1	316
10	404	2	474	62, 4	455
12	508, 511	3	488	10	415
19, 1	267, 546	5	428, 484	15	169
2	266	8	334, 499	63, 1	393, 531
20, 5	273, 399, 461	9	463	3	342
6	274	41, 2	485, 493, 538, 542	4	173, 540
7	306	3	380	5	521
21, 4	336	4	393	6	476
5	516	5	342, 379, 400, 436, 469	10	269, 433, 454
6	372, 471	7	391	65, 1	485, 542
7	513, 536	8	342	2	372
8	379, 474, 496	43, 2	507	3	417
22, 1	323	44, —	358	4	401
2	474, 496	45, 3	547	5	433
3	329, 491	4, 5	446	6	298
4	398, 405	46, 1	529	12	478
6 <i>bis</i>	516	8	245	67, 9	555
8	461	47, 3	342	11	342
11	473	4	494	13	478
14	519	48, 1	433	68, 2	471
23, 2	382	2	404, 484	5	513
3	517	3	502, 545	69, 1	212
24, 3	462	6	545	6	296
5	474 <i>bis</i> , 496	8	169	11	441, 525
6	398	9	471	14	456
25, 3	530	49, 2	493	70, 3	315, 316
4	495, 509, 511, 545	3	529	71, 1	494
6	483, 471, 502	4	462	2	476
7	361	50, 2	494	8	372
26, 2	401	5	377	12	296, 329
2—4	426			13	372, 487
3	471, 511			72, 1	374, 395, 465, 499

contrary" (§ 168, 9), is also often met with, *e. g.* Judges 15, 13; Gen. 35, 10.

The restrictive word **ብሕቱ** "only" (§ 168, 8) is very frequently used in the sense of "still", "however", *ἀλλά, δέ, μάλλον*, not merely in the middle of the clause, as in 1 John 2, 19, but even connecting clauses together; and in this latter case we have mostly the compound form **ወብሕቱ** or **ወ—ብሕቱ**, *e. g.* "I might do thee hurt, **ወብሕቱ : አምላክ : ይቤለኝ** but God said to me" Gen. 31, 29; **ወእብለክሙ : ብሕቱ** "but I say unto you" Matt. 17, 11. "Nevertheless", "notwithstanding" may be expressed by **ወ—ሰ**, *e. g.* Ps. 49, 17, 18; or by **ምስለዝ** "even with that", "in spite of that", *e. g.* 1 Cor. 14, 21; Hen. 90, 11; or by **በኩሉዝ** "after all", *e. g.* Hen. 89, 46. In Negative sentences the same idea is also expressed by **ጥቀ** ("even" § 163, 1) along with **ኢ**, *e. g.* "although I was continually with you, **እዴክሙ : ጥቀ : ኢሰፋሕክሙ** yet you did not stretch forth your hands" Luke 22, 53; Matt. 21, 32. However, in the apodosis of conditional sentences which are introduced by "even if", "if only", "although", the idea—"yet" is usually left unexpressed; *v.*, for instance, Matt. 26, 35.

Intensification is expressed by the Adverbs **ጥቀ** "even", "indeed" (§ 163, 1) and **ፈድፋድ** "exceedingly", "still more", particularly in Negative Clauses, in which **ኢ—ጥቀ** or **ጥቀ—ኢ** answers to *ne—quidem*, *e. g.* in Ex. 11, 7, as well as in Interrogative and Exclamatory sentences. In these last the phrase **እፎ : እንከ : ፈድፋድ** means "how much more then?" when it comes after a positive sentence, and "how much less?" when it comes after one that is negative, *e. g.* Matt. 6, 30; Heb. 12, 25. The expression **ኅድጎሰ**, which has been explained above (§ 163, 3), is also employed in this connection.

The purely restrictive "only" may certainly be expressed by **ብሕቱ** (§ 163, 2), as *e. g.* in Gen. 34, 15; but, seeing that this form of the word is often used in the sense of "still", "however", **ብሕቲቱ** (§ 163, 2) has become the usual expression for "only". Besides, even **ከሙ** is available to indicate that idea, *cf.* § 162, and after Negative sentences **እንበለ** and **ዘእንበለ** "except" (§§ 168, 7 and 170, 4). However, just as,—in the Classical languages,—limitation is expressed not only by Adverbs, but also by inflected Adjectives (*μόνος, solus*), so Ethiopic in many cases prefers this more personal form of expression to the Adverbial one, and employs

for this purpose the word **ባሕቲት**, already described in § 157, with Suffix pronouns attached, *e. g.* **ከያሁ፡ ባሕቲቶ** “him only” Matt. 4, 10.

3. Generally the Conjunction **እስመ** (§ 169, 4) serves to introduce a “cause” or “reason”. It is used with extraordinary frequency, corresponding first of all to our “since”, “seeing that”, “because”, and then farther to our “for”, — for which in fact Ethiopic has no other word. As it has a relative force, it may, together with the clause which it introduces, be even put before the clause containing the statement which has to be explained, *e. g.* **ወእስመ፡ አልቦ፡ ሥርወ፡ የብሰ** “and because it had no root, it withered away” Matt. 13, 6; 22, 25; Judges 15, 2. In the same way the Conjunction of comparison **በከመ** or **ዛከመ** “as” is often used also in the sense of “inasmuch as” and “as long as”, *e. g.* Hen. 81, 3; Gen. 34, 7. A stronger form is found in **በእንተ፡ ዘ** “for this reason, that”, “on the ground, that” (§ 170, 10).

3. Causal
and
Inferential
Expressions.

To indicate *inferences* or *conclusions*, Ethiopic has first of all the enclitic **ኬ** “thus”, and **እንከ** “then”, “therefore”, which nearly always has a place assigned to it after the inferred idea. **እንጋ** “then indeed” is rather a particle of interrogation and doubt, *v. supra*, § 169, 1—3. A stronger form meets us in **በእንተ፡ ዝንቱ** or **በእንተዝ** “for this cause”, “therefore”, *e. g.* Judges 15, 19. In the Bible the form **ወይእኬኒ** “and now”, — corresponding to **ከዳኒ**, is also of pretty frequent occurrence, *e. g.* Gen. 31, 29; Judges 13, 7; 14, 2; 20, 9; — *cf.* also Hen. 94, 1, 3.

(b) ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIVE CLAUSES.

§ 201. A Relative Clause in the narrower sense is usually introduced by the Relative pronoun, which has been described in § 147, *a*. Ethiopic has no other personal Relative, but it has certainly a special Relative Adverb of Place **ኻብ** (§ 161, *b*) “where”, “in which” ⁽¹⁾, “whither”, “to which”, as well as **ኣመ** “when” or “while” (§ 161, *b*), which often at least takes the place of a Relative Adverb of Time. Relative Clauses which, without the intervention of a Relative Pronoun, add a subsidiary qualification to some word in the Principal Clause, are doubtless possible in Ethiopic, but they do not occur so often as in other Semitic tongues, and they seem to be no more than the relics of forms which belonged to a more antique stage of the language. In their case, it is all the

1. Presence
or Absence
of Intro-
ductory
Relative
Pronoun.

(1) [—and sometimes even in the sense of “while”, *v. Kebra Nag.* 102 b 20.]

same whether the word, which is to be farther explained, is definite or not: **አጥፍኦ . . . ሥጋ : አምዕዑተከ** “destroy . . . the flesh, (which) has made thee angry” Hen. 84, 6⁽¹⁾; **በአርአያ : አርአይኩከ** “according to the similitude (which) I showed thee” Ex. 26, 30; 36, 5; **በዕለት : ኢተሐዘበ** “on a day, (on which) he looked not for (him)” Matt. 24, 50; **እቶን : ይነድድ** (*varr.* **ዘይነድድ, እንዘ : ይነድድ**) **ኅለፈ** 1 Esr. 2, 48. Even in the later speech, a Relative Pronoun may be dispensed with, and that most readily when an entire clause is dependent on a Noun standing in the Constr. St., *e. g.* in **በመዋዕለ : ይኩንኑ : መሳፍንት** “in the days (when) the judges ruled” Ruth 1, 1; Gen. 24, 11; Lev. 7, 15, 38; 13, 14; 14, 2; Numb. 6, 13; **ከመ : ኢትርግም : ዕለተ : ተወለድከ** (*var.* : **ዘተወለድከ**) Sir. 23, 14; **በብሔረ : ተፈወወኩ** (*var.* : **በብሔር : ዘተፈወወኩ**) Tob. 3, 15 &c.; also in **ሶበ : ኮነ : ጊዜ : ይዕረብ : ፀሓይ** “when the time came, (that) the sun had to go down” Gen. 15, 17. And it has already been observed (§ 168) that not a few words, almost devoid of signification, which subordinate entire Clauses in this way, have been turned into Conjunctions.

(a) When
Rel. Pron.
is present,
Supporting-
Noun is
sometimes
merely
understood.

1. (a) When, however, the Relative Pronoun is employed, it does not absolutely require to be supported by a Noun expressly mentioned. It may assume a more independent or substantive position, and become also correlative, *i. e.* — to use our way of speaking, — it may include its own Demonstrative, *e. g.* **ዘአምነ : . . . ይድገን** “who (*i. e.* ‘he who’) believeth . . . shall be saved” Mark 16, 16; **አልሙ : ዘይበልዑ** “they had not (anything) which they could eat” Mark 8, 1. Accordingly **ዘ** may signify “who”, “what”, “one who”, “something which”, “he who”, “that which”. Hence this simple Relative Pronoun is wont to suffice for the idea of “whoever”, “whatever”; and only when it must take at the same time a distributive sense is it commonly doubled (*cf.* § 159, *g*), as, for instance, in **ከሎሙ : ዘዘሐለዮሙ : ልሙ : ያምጽኡ** “they are all to bring whatever their heart thinks right” Ex. 35, 5. What is said here of **ዘ** holds good also of **ኀበ** and **አመ** (*v. infra*). No doubt, for the sake of clearness, and particularly when **ዘ** has to refer to a somewhat distant Noun, the Demonstrative may farther be expressly set down before the Relative Pronoun, as in **ውእቱ : ዘነጽሐ** “(for) him who has been subjected to cleansing” Lev. 14, 19; Gen. 15, 17; **እሉ : እለ** “those, who” Judges 6, 10; **ዝከቱ : ዘአም**

(¹) [FLEMMING, however, reads **እንተ** between **ሥጋ** and the Verb. TR.]

ጽኢ Lev. 1, 4; this however is by no means necessary. If on the other hand the Relative Clause comes first, especially if it is not quite short, the reference to it is frequently indicated by a demonstrative pronoun, placed at the head of the principal clause, *e. g.* **እለ : አነ : እቤለከ : እሙንቱ : ይሐሩ** Judges 7, 4; Matt. 24, 13. In the case of a Relative Pronoun, such as has been described above, which stands alone, and includes within it its own Demonstrative, the distinctions of Gender and Number are carefully attended to; and the Case-relations, which such a Relative Clause assumes within the Principal Clause, as representing a Noun Substantive, are denoted, precisely as with any Noun, *e. g.* **ዘአምነ : . . . ይድገን** Mark 16, 16; **ኢኮንከሙ : አንትሙ : እለ : ትትናገሩ** “ye are not those who speak” (‘it is not ye that speak’) Matt. 10, 20; **ርኢኩ : ዘሎቱ : ርእሰ : መዋዕል** “I saw one who had a hoary head (*lit.* ‘a head of days’)” Hen. 46, 1; Numb. 23, 8; Judges 17, 6; **ትተልዎሙ : ለእለ : የዐፅዱ** Ruth 2, 3; Luke 9, 11 (in accordance with § 172, c); **ደመ : ዘቀተለ** “the blood of that which he has slain” Numb. 23, 24; Hen. 49, 3⁽¹⁾; **ምስለ : እለ : ሞቱ** “with those who are dead” Ruth 1, 8 &c. It is worthy of remark that a Relative pronoun of the 3rd Pers. may refer even to a 1st Pers., *e. g.* **ወእከውን : ዘይደሉ** (= **ድልወ**) Sap. 9, 12.

Even to a separate pronoun which is virtually in the Genitive, the Relative may be referred by means of **ለ**, *e. g.* **Ascensio Isaiæ** 7, 20, and in the same way to a Dative (like **ለጸድቃን : — ለእለ**), *e. g.* **Asc. Is.** 8, 26; 9, 21; 7, 21; 10, 16; 11, 16⁽²⁾.

(b) On the other hand when the Relative pronoun refers to a Noun expressly mentioned in the principal clause, which it qualifies like an attributive Adjective, while this noun at the same time precedes the relative clause, — then it is not indispensably necessary that the relative pronoun [should agree with the Noun in Gender and Number: frequently the Relative **ዘ** continues to keep its readiest form, as a general Relative sign (§ 147, a) even when it refers to feminine and plural Nouns, *e. g.* **መሳከው : ርገ ዋት : ዘእምኔሆን** “open windows, out of which” Hen. 72, 7; **አንስ**

(b) Usages when Sup-
porting-
Noun is
expressly
mentioned.

(¹) FLEMMING reads here **ወመንፈስ : ዘያሌቡ** instead of DILLMANN'S **ወመንፈስ : ዘ"**, i. e. “the Spirit which bestows understanding” instead of “the Spirit of Him who bestows understanding”. TR.]

(²) Cf. TRUMPF, GGA 1877, p. 1544 sqq. *ad loca*.

ትያ : ዘኅረዩ “wives, whom they might choose” Gen. 6, 2. If the Noun, with which the Relative is associated, is a Suff. pron., the reference is contrived by prefixing **ለ** to the Relative: **ምስሉን : ለእለ : ጸርን** “with us, who have borne” Matt. 20, 12. It is not, however, absolutely necessary that the Noun, to which the Relative refers, should come before the latter: on the contrary, it may follow the Relative just like the Adjective (according to § 188), *e. g.* **ኢትእርዩ : ዘወድቀ : እክለ** “gather not up the corn which has fallen aside” Lev. 19, 9; Deut. 33, 11. If again the Noun has the adjunct **ኩሉ**, it is very common for the Relative Clause to be inserted between **ኩሉ** and the Noun, *e. g.* **ኩሉ : ዘይትገበር : በእሳት : ንዋይ** Numb. 31, 23; **ኩሎ : ዘትገበሩ : ቃለ** Deut. 1, 18. Then too, the *Attraction of Noun.* *Attraction* of the Noun to which the Relative refers, from the principal clause into the relative clause, is a favourite turn in Ethiopic, just as it is in the classical languages⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* **ውስተ : እንተ : በእክሙ : ሀገር** “into whatsoever city ye enter” Matt. 10, 11; **ወአልቦ : ህዩ : ዘይሰቲ : ማየ** Ex. 17, 1; **ኢረከብኩ : ዘመጠነዝ : ሃይ ማኖት** “I have not found so great faith” Matt. 8, 10. Or at least an adjective belonging to the leading Noun is drawn into the Relative Clause, as in **ዝንቱ : ደብር : ዘርኢከ : ነዊኅ** “this high mountain, which thou hast seen” Hen. 25, 3. To this class belong also cases like **ወጻድቅስ : ዘይትገደፍ : ኢርኢኩ** Ps. 36, 26; **ኩሉ : መቅወፍት : ዘኢኮነ : ጽሑፈ : ውስተ : ዝንቱ : መጽሐፈ : ሕግ : ያመ ጽእ : እግዚአብሔር : ላዕሌከ** Deut. 28, 61. Thus also we have **አመ : ዕለተ** “what day” (‘the day on which’) Gen. 3, 5. In particular, **ኩሉ**, when it immediately precedes the **ዘ**, is generally combined closely with the Relative, and is regulated then in its construction, not by the principal clause, but by the Relative clause, *e. g.* **ትግበሩ : ኩሉ : ዘጽሑፍ** “(‘and that’) ye do everything which (= whatever) is written” Josh. 23, 6; Numb. 18, 15; Deut. 6, 1, 20; 11, 3; 34, 12,

As regards specially the Adverb of Place **ኅበ**, it may be employed, like **ዘ**, correlatively, and may signify: “in the place where”, “to the place where”, “in the place whither”, “to the place whither”, *e. g.* **ሐረ : ኅበ : ይቀርፅ** Gen. 31, 19; **እንበር : ኅበ : ረከብኩ** Judges 17, 9; **ታስተጋብእ : እምኅበ : ኢዘረውከ** “gatherest (from) where thou hast not strawed” Matt. 25, 24; **መልዕልተ : ኅበ : ሀሎ : ሕፃን**

(1) Cf. EWALD ‘*Hebr. Spr.*’ § 334, a.

“over where the young child was” Matt. 2, 9; **ኢረከበት : ኅበ : ታዐርፍ : እግራ** “she found not (a place) where she could rest her foot” Gen. 8, 9; **ሐቅል : ውእቱ : ኅበ : ሀለውኅ** “it is a desert place, where we are” Luke 9, 12; [**ዘበቱ : ጥሪተ : ኅበ : ሃኔ : ወቀንቀኔ : ኢያማስኖ** “who has treasures there where moth and worm do not destroy them” *Chrest.* p. 47, l. 9]. But **ኅበ** may also be associated with some noun expressly mentioned before,—in the first place, with nouns of place, as in **መካኖ : ኅበ : ኖመ : ህየ** “his place, where he sleeps” Ruth 3, 4; Luke 10, 5; as well as with names of things and names of persons; and in that case it fills the place of the Relative pronoun **ዘ**, taking a corresponding preposition of place, *e. g.* **ሰረገላተ : በኅበ : የዐርግ** “the chariots (Acc.) into which he mounts” Hen. 72, 5; 73, 2; **መላእክተ : መቅወፍቱ : በኅበ : ሀለዉ : ምጥዋኒ** “his avenging angels, to whom they had been given over” Hen. 63, 1,—in a way similar to that in which **ህየ** may also be used in such cases, conjoined with a foregoing **ዘ**, *e. g.* **ኢሕዛብ : እለ : ትበውእ : ህየ** “the nations to whom thou comest” Deut. 12, 29.

§ 202. 2. *The Case-relations of the Relative Pronoun within the Relative Clause may be expressed in various ways.*

(a) The ordinary way of indicating these relations of Case is by treating the Relative Pron.,—though inflected according to Gender and Number,—merely as a general mark of relation which needs to be supplemented by Personal Pronouns. To be sure, when the Relative appears as the Subject of the Relative Clause, there is no necessity for its being supplemented by any Personal pronoun, because all needful supplementing is contained in the Verb itself, *e. g.* **ብእሲ : ዘየሐውር** “the man, who goes”. In like manner the supplementing process may be dispensed with, when the Relative has to take, as we would say, the Objective case or Accusative, because its Case-relation then is usually understood from the context, *e. g.* **ምድር : እንተ : ወሀበከ** “the land, which he has given thee”. Still, even in this case, the supplementary Pronoun is just as often added as omitted, as in **ኢሕዛብ : ዘእንት ሙ : ትትወረስዎሙ** “the nations whom ye shall (as heirs) succeed” Deut. 12, 2: and this is particularly necessary, when the Relative pron. refers to a Pronoun of the 1st or 2nd Person. If the Relative Pron. stands related as a Genitive to a Noun in the Relative Clause, this is indicated, not by the Relative but by a Suffix at-

2. Expression of Case-relations of the Rel. Pron. within Rel. Clause.
(a) By supplementing Rel. Pron. by a Pers. Pron. attached as Suffix to Noun concerned.

tached to the Noun: **ሀገር : እንተ : ስማ : ሲካር** “a city, the name of which is Sychar” John 4, 5; **ዘይበጽሕ : ርእሱ** “the top of which will reach” Gen. 11, 4; **እለ : ፍጹማን : እደዊሆሙ** “whose hands are consecrated” Numb. 3, 3. In case the Genitive has to be expressed by a Preposition (§ 186), the indication is given by attaching a Suffix to the Preposition; “the Church, **እንተ : ላቲ : ተሠደምኩ** : **ላእከ** as a servant of which I have been set” Col. 1, 25; “two servants, **ዘአሐዱ : እምኔሆሙ** one of whom”.—In the same way when the relation of the Relative pronoun in the Relative clause has to be assigned to that pronoun with the help of a Preposition, the usual practice is to place the Preposition, with a corresponding Suff. pron., after the Relative, and either immediately after it or separated from it by one or two words, *e. g.* **ሀገር : እንተ : እምኔሃ** “the city, from which” Josh. 20, 6; **ምድር : እንተ : በውስቴታ : ተወልዶ** “the land, in which he was born” Gen. 11, 28; **አዕማድ : እለ : ዲቤሆን : ይቀውም : ዝንቱ : ቤት** “the pillars upon which this house standeth” Judges 16, 26; **ዘመጸእ ኪ : ኀቤሁ** “to whom thou art come” Ruth 2, 12; [**መካን : ዘተሐውር : ኀቤሁ** *Contentings of the Apostles* 155, 8]; **ብእሲ : ዘኢኀለቁ : ሎቱ : እግዚአብሔር : ኀጢአቶ** “the man to whom God imputeth not his sin” Ps. 31, 2.—It is but very rarely, in such a case, that the reference of the Relative Pron. to the Pron. Suff. which follows, is separately indicated by a **ለ** prefixed to the Relative, *e. g.* in **ለእለ : ውስቴቶሙ : ሀሎከ** instead of a mere **እለ** Ex. 34, 10.

(b) By prefixing Prepositions and Signs of Case to the Rel. Pron. itself.

(b) But the Relative Pronoun may be treated also, — in Ethiopic just as in the Indo-European languages,—as an actual Pronominal Adjective. On that view depends the second method of assigning to the Relative its Case-relations within the Relative Clause. That method consists in simply placing the signs of Case and the prepositions before the Relative, *e. g.* “money, **በዘ : ንሣየጥ : እክለ** with which we are to buy corn” Gen. 43, 22; “he enquired about the time, **በዘ : አስተርአዮሙ : ኮከብ** at which the star had appeared to them” Matt. 2, 7; **ነንረከ : በዘ : ያስሕተከ** “he hath spoken to thee that wherewith he will lead thee astray” Deut. 13, 6; Ex. 34, 35; Gen. 31, 32; Ex. 28, 4; **ኩሉ : ውስተ : ዘወድቀ : በድኖሙ** “every (thing), upon which the dead body of (any of) them falleth” Lev. 11, 32, 35; **ዲበ : ዘርኢከ : ይወርድ : መንፈስ : ቅዱስ** “upon whom thou seest the Holy Spirit descending” John 1, 33; **አእምር : ለዘተገብር** γυνῶθι τὴν ποισίς Sir. 12, 1; **አልቦ : ለዘ :**

አዘዘ “he has commanded no one” Sir. 15, 20; **ለአመ : ብከ : በዘት በቀዮ** “if thou hast anything, through which thou art profitable to him” Sir. 13, 14; **ወሀሮሙ : ልበ : በዘ : ይሐልዩ** καρδίαν ἔδωκε δια- νοῦναι αὐτῷ Sir. 17, 6; **ዕክ : በዘ : ይትገበር** Sap. 14, 7; **አልቦ : ለዘ ሮጎሮ : ወአልቦ : ለዘይፈርህ** “he (God) shuns no one, and is afraid of no one” (while, without **ለ**, the meaning might be: “no one shuns him, or is afraid of him”) *Clem.* 204, *b*.

Occasionally the two forms of construction are so blended together, that the preposition is both placed before the Relative pronoun, and repeated after it with Suff. pron. in the Relative Clause itself, as in “blessed are they, **ለእለ : ኢሐሰበ : ሎሙ : ነጉ ሎ : ጌጋዮሙ** Ps. 31, 1; **ወቦ : ለዘወሀቦ : ጎምስተ : መክሊተ** Matt. 25, 15; **በትረከ : በዘቦቱ : ዘበጥከ** Ex. 17, 5; 30, 4, 36; 39, 17; Lev. 11, 34 &c.

(c) Meanwhile, longer prepositions are not usually placed before the Relative Pronoun; but Ethiopic has acquired the remarkable faculty of placing them after it⁽¹⁾: **ምድር : እንተ : ጎበ : መጻእን** “the land, to which we have come” Gen. 47, 4; **እበን : ዘጎበ** “stones, in which” Lev. 14, 40; **ጎለቁ : ዘእምነ : ይወፅኡ : ጎዋጎወ** “I counted the gates from which they came forth” Hen. 33, 3; **ጎዋጎወ : እለ : እምጎበ : ይወፅእ : ፀሐይ** “the gates (Acc.) from which the sun comes forth” Hen. 72, 3; **ብዙጎ : ዘእምተጽሕፈ : ዘኮነ : ጸብእ : ላዕለ : ንጉሥ** “more numerous than have been described (here) were the wars which the king had to conduct” (*lit.* ‘more than what has been written of (here), (was) the warfare which was by the king’) *Histoire des guerres d’Amda Seyōn* (ed. PERRUCHON, Paris 1890), p. 113, l. 14 sq. But quite short, monosyllabic prepositions are never, as far as known, placed after the Relative Pron. in this way.

The placing of the Preposition *before* the Relative, the relation of which within the Relative Clause is pointed out by the preposition, occasions no dubiety of any kind, when the Relative pron. refers to a Noun previously mentioned. But when the Relative is employed in a more correlative and substantive sense (§ 201), as in the sentence: — **ዲበ : ዘርኢከ : ይወርድ : መንፈስ : ቅዱስ** “upon whom thou seest the Holy Spirit descending”, this mode of expression is permissible only if there is no possible doubt

(1) Like *quocum*, or *wherewith*, *whereupon* &c.

regarding the reference of the Relative pron. within the principal Clause. The Preposition occurs before the Relative with most frequency, when it depends both on the Verb of the principal clause and on that of the Relative Clause: **እኔ ለ፡ እክለ ፡ ጎበ ፡ እለ ፡ ረከብኩ ፡ ጥገሰ** “I will glean ears of corn with those with whom I find favour” Ruth 2, 2.

By virtue of that freer use of the Accusative, which is described in § 174 *sq.*, the Relative pron. may, in several cases in which other languages have it preceded by a preposition, be simply subordinated in the Accusative; thus, in particular, when it is associated with an expression of time, as in **በካልእት ፡ ዓመት ፡ ዘወፅኡ** “in the second year after they had come out” Numb. 1, 1; **እምዓመት ፡ ዘተሣየጦ** “from the year, in which he bought him” Lev. 25, 50; Ps. 89, 17; and in other cases also, such as **ቅብአ ፡ ዘይትቀብኡ** “the oil (Acc.), with which they are anointed” Ex. 35, 28; 38, 25 (for which, in Ex. 40, 7, we have **ዘቦቱ ፡ ይትቀብኡ**); and still more freely in **ምንት ፡ ጌጋይዩ ፡ ዘዴገንከኒ** “what is my guilt that (*or* ‘on account of which’) thou dost pursue me?” Gen. 31, 36 (but yet v. § 203, 1, *a*).

3. Relative Construction as Periphrastic Substitute for Participles and Adjectives.

3. *The Relative construction is a favourite one in Ethiopic, and is in frequent use.* Above all, Participles which may be wanting in the language, as well as Adjectives, are periphrastically indicated by Relative clauses, *e. g.* **ዘይነድድ** “burning” Hen. 14, 12; **ዘኢያእመረ** “unwitting” Gen. 20, 4; **ዘይመጽእ** or **ዘይከውን** “future”; **ዘሀሎ** “present” Rom. 8, 38; **ዘይትነገር** “so-called” Hen. 17, 4; **ዘይዘርእ** “sower” Matt. 13, 3; **ዘይልሀቅ** “the elder”; **ዘይንእስ** “the younger” Gen. 19, 31 *sqq.*; **ዘለዓለም** “everlasting”; **ዘቀዲሙ** “the earlier” Deut. 10, 4. In particular, those Adjectives, which express Capability or Incapability of any kind, are indicated in this circumlocutory fashion, such as **ዘይቀትል** “deadly” Ps. 7, 14; **ዘይመውት** “mortal”; **ዘኢይመውት** “immortal”; **ዘኢይትመጠን** “immeasurable”; **ዘኢይትኃለቑ** “innumerable”; **ዘኢያስተርኢ** “invisible” &c. In the same way the privative Adjectives of our tongues are expressed, and those which in our tongues are compounded of two or more words, *e. g.* **ኅሩያን ፡ (እለ ፡) ጉልቑ ፡ አልቦሙ** “unnumbered elect” (§ 201, *init.*); **ዘሠለስቱ ፡ ዓመቱ** “three-year-old” Gen. 15, 9; **ዘአልቦ ፡ ማየ** “waterless” Ps. 106, 4; **መጥበሕት ፡ እንተ ፡ ክልኤቱ ፡ አፈዊሃ** “a two-edged sword” Judges 3, 16; **ዘአልቦ ፡ ፈውሰ** “incurable” Deut. 28, 27; **ዘአልቦ ፡ ጌጋየ** “innocent”

Ex. 23, 7. Even when a corresponding Adjective does exist in the language, the periphrastic rendering by means of a Relative clause is often preferred, as being more forcible or more elegant, as in **ዘየዐቢ : ብርሃን : ወዘይንእስ : ብርሃን** “the greater light and the lesser light” Gen. 1, 16; **እለ : ተርፉ** “the remaining” John 6, 12; Josh. 21, 26; **ዘየኣኪ** (for **እኩይ**) Matt. 12, 45. Farther, an Adjective is frequently connected with its Substantive by means of the Relative pronoun,—not only when it has an adverbial adjunct along with it, as in **ዘኢያው : ለዓለም** “the ever-living one” Hen. 5, 1, but also when it must be emphatic: **እምነ : እንስሳ : ዘንጹሕ** “of clean beasts” (contrasted with the *unclean*) Gen. 7, 2; **ወልድ : ዘበኩራ** “her firstborn son” Matt. 1, 25; Gen. 25, 25; 27, 19 (as against Gen. 38, 6)⁽¹⁾. That the Possessive pronouns **ዚኣየ** &c. are often joined to their substantives by means of **ዘ** (*e. g.* Gen. 37, 7; 31, 18, 21), has been remarked already (v. *supra*, § 150, b).

The Relative style is also employed in many instances to attach any kind of subsidiary qualification to a Noun, *e. g.* **ጠየቁ : ኩሉ : ዘውስተ : ሰማይ : ግብረ** “I observed all the works (done) in Heaven” Hen. 2, 1; **ኣድባር : ዘእምእብን : ክቡር** “mountains (composed) of precious stones” Hen. 18, 6. And in almost every case our preposition “without”,—for which otherwise **እንበለ** (p. 403 *sq.*) is alone available—, is expressed by **ዘኣልዐ**, *e. g.* **ኣባግዕ : ዘኣልዐ : ኖላዌ** “sheep without shepherds” Numb. 27, 17.

Finally, as has been pointed out already, (v. § 197, c), either the impersonal and adverbial Relative **ዘ** *quod*, or the personal Relative pron., is employed with special frequency after the negatives **ኣኮ** and **ኣልዐ**, *e. g.* **ኣኮ : ኩሉ : ዘይብለኒ : እግዚኦ : እግዚኦ : ዘይበውእ : ውስተ : መንግሥተ : ሰማያት** “not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter (*lit.* “is he who shall enter”) into the kingdom of heaven” Matt. 7, 21. In like manner examples will be found in § 197, c, which show that in the circuitous rendering of “no man”, “nothing” &c. by means of **ኣልዐ : ዘ**, the verb may occur in any mood which the connection imposes upon it, and particularly in the Subjunctive: **ኣልዐ : ዘየህሉ : . . .** “there shall be no man . . .” Lev. 16, 17; Josh. 6, 10; Matt. 16, 20.

(1) That **በኩር** precisely is so often joined to its substantive by the Relative pron. may doubtless be explained, besides, by the fact that its proper meaning is “first birth” not “firstborn”.

4. Position
of Words in
a Relative
Clause.

4. The position of the words in the Relative clause does not differ essentially from the arrangement in the ordinary sentence. Only, if the Relative pron. is supplemented by a preposition which has a suff. pron. attached to it, this preposition very often comes immediately after the Relative (v. examples given above). And just as in any sentence (v. § 196) a word may acquire special emphasis from being placed at the head of the sentence, so in Relative sentences too the word or words which have to be emphasised precede the Relative pron., e. g. **ወኢያሪከሰ : ዕጹት : ይእቲ : ወጥቅም : ዘላዕሌሃ** “now Jericho was strictly closed, and had a (good) wall round it” Josh. 6, 1; **መካን : እምዝ : ዘይጌርም** “a place still more frightful than this” Hen. 21, 7⁽¹⁾; **ወኩሉ : ዘገብረ : ተኣምረ** “and who did all the wonders” Josh. 24, 17; **በነቢይ : ዘተብህለ** “that which was said by the prophet” Matt. 21, 4; **ብእሲ : ኅበ : ኩሉ : ሰብኡ : ወሥጋሁ : ዘይከውን : ኢይበእ** “a man shall not go in unto any of his own near kin or of his own flesh” Lev. 18, 6. In some instances a word would seem to be put first, not entirely for the sake of emphasis, but rather with the aim of giving a certain polish to the sentence: this, accordingly, is a question of greater or less refinement in style⁽²⁾.

(c) CONJUNCTIONAL RELATIVE CLAUSES.

1. Subject
or Object
expressed
by an entire
Clause:—

(a) Declara-
tive Clause
introduced

by **H**.

§ 203. 1. If the Subject or Object of a Sentence cannot be expressed by a noun, but must be indicated periphrastically by an entire Clause, the Clause, which in this way declares the Subject or Object, may be attached by Relative Conjunctions, which answer, generally, to our declarative conjunction “that”.

(a) When the Declarative Clause is pointed to even in the Principal Clause, by some demonstrative pron. or by the personal pron. inherent in the verb⁽³⁾, the Relative pron. **ዘ**,—used in a

(1) [FLEMMING here adopts the variant **ዘይጌርም**. TR.]

(2) [In the following passage an entire Relative Clause assumes in the sentence the position, and apparently the character, of an *absoluter Vorhalt*:—**ወእለሰ : ይብሉ : በትሕትና : ልብ : ኢይደልወን : ለቢሰ : ከህነት : ሉሙሰ : ኅቤሆሙ : ይኔጽር : እግዚአብሔር** “and as for those who say in humility of heart—‘we are not worthy of being invested with the priesthood’—, to them God has regard” *Le Livre des Mystères*, p. 35, l. 2 sq. TR.]

(3) But such a reference to the declarative clause is usually met with, only when that clause represents the logical Subject of the Principal Clause.

neutral sense as we would say, for “that which”, “the fact, that”, “I mean, that”—forms a sufficient introductory Particle for such declarative clause. Thus we have: **ምንትነ፡ ውእቱ፡ ዝንቱ፡ ዘአፍጠንከ፡ ረኪብ** “how is it (*lit.* ‘what or why is this’) that thou hast found so quickly?” Gen. 27, 20; **ለምንት፡ ዝንቱ፡ ዘአውፃኣከሙነ** “wherefore is it that ye have brought us out?” Numb. 20, 5; Judges 13, 18; Mark 1, 27; Gen. 12, 18; **ምንተ፡ ገበርኩ፡ ጽምሒተ፡ ዘትትጎጥኣኒ** “what have I done, that thou art secretly stealing away from me?” Gen. 31, 26 — (on the position of **ጽምሒተ** v. *infra*). Farther, **ዘ** is employed after semi-personal verbs (§ 192, *b*), to attach to them some thought which is their logical subject, *e. g.* **መሰሉሙ፡ ዘተሐውር** “it seemed to them, that she was going . .” John 11, 31; Matt. 20, 10; 26, 53; Gen. 31, 31. It is also used frequently after **ቦ**, **አልቦ** and **ኣኮ** (v. §§ 197; 198); but in the case of **ይበቀሖ** “it profits”, the logical Subject of the verb may also be introduced to it by **ለእመ**, Matt. 16, 26; Gen. 37, 26 (just as in Greek). **ዘ** with its clause may even be placed before the principal clause, in the meaning — “as regards the circumstance, that —” or “this (fact) that”, *e. g.* **ወዘይቤ** “and (as regards the fact) that he says” Heb. 12, 27; 4 Esra 6, 51.

(*b*) But if the Clause, which is introduced by “that”, is meant not merely as an additional declaration or explanation of an idea, already hinted at in the principal clause, but rather as the attachment of a necessary completion of the sense of the verb in that clause,—as, for instance, the Object of the Verb, after Verbs of *Saying, Perceiving, Thinking, Commanding, Fearing, Beginning* and so on,—then other Conjunctions and expressions are employed, and mostly **ከመ** and **እከመ**. (*b*) Supplementary Object-
Clause introduced by
ከመ,
እከመ &c.

(*α*) After Verbs of *Perceiving, Recognising, Thinking, Seeming, Supposing, &c.*, **ከመ** (“how”) “that”—appears the most readily: **ርእየ፡ ከመ፡ በዝኅ** “he saw that it abounded” Gen. 6, 5; Judges 16, 27; **ይመስለኒ፡ ከመ** “it seems to me that . .” Hen. 106, 6; **ኣእመረ፡ ከመ፡ ተነትጎ፡ ማይ** “he knew that the waters were abated” Gen. 8, 11; Ps. 4, 4; also **ግበር፡ ሊተ፡ ተኣምረ፡ ከመ፡ ኣንተ፡ ውእቱ** “show me a sign (by which I may know) that it is thou” Judges 6, 17. The place of **ከመ** may, however, be taken by other Conjunctions having the meaning “how” (ὡς), such as **ዘከመ**, **በከመ**, **እፎ**, and that too not merely in cases in which the mode and manner of the transaction are of more interest than (*α*) After Verbs of
Perceiving, Recognising, &c.

the fact of it, *e. g.* in Matt. 18, 31; Ruth 3, 16, but even in cases in which we are able to translate by “that”, *e. g.* in Hen. 9, 6; Ps. 9, 13; Hen. 5, 1. **እስመ** “because” is also used, though more rarely, for “that” (*ἔτι*), *e. g.* **ታክምሩ : እስመ** Hen. 98, 8.—It has already been explained (v. § 190), that after the Verbs named, the clause which serves as their Object may also be subordinated without the interposition of a Conjunction, as in **ርእየ : ተሰጥቀ : ሰማ ይ : ወወረደ : መንፈስ : ቅዱስ** “he saw heaven rent open and the Holy Spirit descending” Mark 1, 10; Hen. 83, 3; or the Object-Clause may be put first: **ወናሁ : ነሎሙ : እሙራን : ርኢኩ** “and lo, I saw all of them bound” Hen. 90, 23. Farther it has been pointed out that in such a case the Subject of the subordinate clause may also be specially brought into notice in the principal clause in the form of a Suff. Pron. attached to the verb in that clause, as in **ረከቦ : ይቀውም** “he found him standing” Numb. 23, 6; or even that the subordinate clause may be introduced by the particle **እንዘ** which serves to indicate Participles by way of periphrasis, and to introduce Circumstantial clauses, *e. g.* **ርእያ : አዕ ይንትየ : በህየ : ነሎሙ : ኃጥአን : እንዘ : ይሰደዱ** “my eyes saw there all sinners driven away” Hen. 41, 2, where **እንዘ : ይሰደዱ** answers to a Greek participle, and **ነሎሙ : ኃጥአን**, which should be Object of **ርእያ** and should stand in the Accusative, is drawn by Attraction into the secondary clause as Subject (v. *infra*); or the subordinate clause may be introduced even by **በዘ**, *e. g.* in **በ ዘተወሰኩ** *Chrest.* p. 19, line 1. On the Acc. with the Infin. after such verbs, v. § 190, 2.

(β) After
Verbs of
Saying,
Declaring
&c.

(β) After Verbs of *Saying, Declaring*, and so on, the clause which contains their Object is, as a rule, attached by **ከመ** (§ 169, 6), *e. g.* **መሐለ : ከመ : ኢያክምር** “he swore that he knew not” Matt. 26, 72; more rarely by **እስመ**, *e. g.* **መሐልኩ : . . . እስመ** “I swear . . . that” Hen. 98, 6; **ይብል : እስመ : ዝንቱ : ወልድ : ይከውን : ን ዋየ : ጎሩየ** *Chrest.* p. 37, line 26⁽¹⁾. If the words spoken are quoted in *oratio directa*, they generally follow without being attached by a conjunction; but still, **ከመ** or **እስመ** may be employed in Ethiopic, just like *ἔτι* in Greek, to introduce the *oratio directa*, *e. g.* Lev. 14, 35; Josh. 5, 6; Matt. 2, 23; 21, 16; Hen. 83, 7; *Chrest.*

(1) Very rarely by the Accus. and the Infin. (§ 190, 2), or even by the Accus. and a following Subjunctive (§ 190, 6).

p. 29, line 27; *Hexaëm.* p. 32, line 24; sometimes even **ዘ** is used, *e. g.* **ወይቤሉ : ዘአኮ : ንፈርሆሙ : ለደቂቀ : እስራኤል** Judith 5, 23. Occasionally the introductory **ይቤ** “he said”, or other like form, is placed merely at the end of the quotation, *e. g.* **እስመ : አብደ : ይቤልዎ** “for ‘he is out of his mind’, they said of him” Mark 3, 21; Gen. 39, 17; Judges 21, 5; Hen. 55, 3; or else **ይቤ**, or the like form, even when it has been placed before the quotation, may be repeated at its close, *e. g.* Gen. 3, 3.

(γ) The Object-clause after Verbs of *Fearing* and *Guarding against* may, in accordance with § 182, *a*, be subordinated in the Infinitive, as in **እመ : ትፈርህ : በሕቲትከ : ወሪደ** “if thou fearest to go down alone” Judges 7, 10; or in the Infinitive with **ለ** (§ 183, *a*), *e. g.* **ኩሎ : ቃለ : ዕቀብ : ለገቢር** *πᾶν ῥῆμα φυλάξει ποιεῖν* Deut. 13, 1; or even by **ከመ : ኢ** with a following Subjunctive (inasmuch as one desires that the thing, which he fears, should not happen), *e. g.* **እፈርህ : እምኔህ : ከመ : ኢይምጸእ** “I am afraid of him, lest he should come” Gen. 32, 12; 24, 9; Hen. 106, 6; **ይኔጽርሙ : ዘልፈ : ለአዕዋፍ : ከመ : ኢይረዱ : ወኢይብልዑ : ዘርአ : ለወልደ : እግዚአብሔር** “he was ever on the watch against the birds, lest they should descend and devour the seed (‘of’) sown by the Son of God” *Chronique de Galāwdēwos* (ed. CONZELMAN, 1895), p. 62, l. 1 *sq.*; [*Chrest.*, p. 5, l. 13 *sq.*]; or even by **ኢ** alone, with a Subjunctive, *e. g.* **ዑቅ : ርእሰከ : ኢታግብአ** Gen. 24, 6; 31, 29; or, finally, and indeed frequently, by **ዮጊ** (§ 169, 10) with a following Indicative⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* **እፈርህ : ዮጊ : ኢትፈቅዱ** “I am afraid ye may not be willing” Hen. 6, 3; Josh. 9, 5. **ዮጊ** is also used without being introduced by a verb, and it answers then to our “beware lest”, *e. g.* Deut. 4, 19; Lev. 10, 19; Ex. 34, 15. If the idea of fearing, &c., is negated, then we have invariably **ከመ** with the Subjunctive, *e. g.* **ኢተዐቀበ : ከመ : ይሖር** “he took no heed to walk” 4 Kings 10, 31.

(δ) Verbs of *Beginning* and *Leaving off* may indeed take their Object-clause in the Infinitive, or even in the Subjunctive (without **ከመ**), *e. g.* Mark 1, 45; but the more usual construction, especially after Verbs of Beginning, is the one with **እንዘ** and a following Imperfect (answering to the Participle in Greek): **አገዙ :**

(1) The Indicative is explained by the fundamental meaning of **ዮጊ** which is “perhaps”: the clause which is introduced by it is thus to be regarded always as *oratio directa*.

እንዘ : ይወግኡ : ጀለካልኡ “they began to push one another” Hen. 87, 1; 89, 15, 72.

(ε) After
Verbs of
Ability,
Under-
standing &c.

(ε) On the various methods by which other Verbs,—such as, *e. g.* those of *Ability, Understanding, Custom, Command, Prohibition, Permission, Willingness* and *Unwillingness, Requesting, Demanding, Reminding*, as well as *Semi-Personal Verbs*,—have their Object-, and Subject-clauses attached to them, *v. supra*, § 181 *sqq.*

2. Remote
Object—
Design,
Con-
sequence,
Cause &c.—
expressed
by an entire
Clause.

2. When the more remote Object of an action, or its Design, Consequence, Cause, and so on, has to be expressed by an entire clause, there is doubtless available for this purpose (§ 183) the construction with the Infinitive and prefixed Prepositions, and in certain cases Subordination by means of the Subjunctive; but along with these constructions there occurs also that of connecting the clauses by Conjunctions; and in certain cases this last construction is the only permissible one.

(α) Final
Clauses.

(α) For *Final Clauses*,—in so far as they are not subordinated by the Infinitive with **ለ**, or (a very common case) by the immediate and close association of the Subjunctive,—**ከመ** with the Subjunctive is made use of (*v. supra* § 183, c), *e. g.* **ከመ : አእምር**, *var.* of **ለአእምር** Sap. 7, 17; or (like *qui* with the Subjunctive in Latin) the Relative Pron. **ዘ** with a following Subjunctive, *e. g.* “they sought false witnesses, **በዘ : ይቅጥልዎ** that through them (or ‘that thereby’) they might bring about his death” Matt. 26, 59; Gen. 46, 5; Ruth 4, 14. Even **ለ** is used as an equivalent for **ከመ**, *e. g.* in **ዘአንገሥ : ለይንግሥ** Jer. 37, 1 (*Fref.*). Indeed in every dependent clause, which contains a purpose, a wish, an obligation or expression of will, there is such a necessity for the Subjunctive that, even after Verbs of *Saying* and *Perceiving*, it must be employed, *e. g.* **ይእዜ : አእመርነ : ከመ : ንሰብሐ** “now do we comprehend that we have to praise him” Hen. 63, 4; **ይትበሀል : ለቅዱሳን : ከመ : ይገሥዱ** “it will be told the saints that they must seek” Hen. 58, 5; and thus always, when “say” is equivalent to “command” (§ 182, b, β),—indeed even when “say” conveys merely the statement of an opinion, although not very often: **መነ : ይብልዎ : ይኩን : ሰብእ : ለወልደ : እኔለ : አመሕያው** “whom say the people, as to the Son of man, that he is?” (*i. e.* ‘of whom do the people say, that he is the Son of man?’) Matt. 16, 13. *Cf.* also **ኢየሱስ : ይምጽኡ : ምስሌሆሙ** *G. Ad.* 62, 8; **ተናገሮ : ያድገዋል**

G. Ad. 6, 18 (where the **ከመ** which is added by TRUMPP is not necessary); **እትአመነከመ** : . . . **ከመ** : **ትፈጽመ** Rom. 15, 14; Hebr. 6, 7; **ኢተዘከረ** : **ይግበር** Ps. 108, 14.

(b) *Consecutive Clauses* are attached (α) by **እስከ** (§ 169, 8) (b) Consecutive Clauses. “until that”, i. e. “so that”,⁽¹⁾ generally with an Indicative following, e. g. “he answered nothing **እስከ** : **ያነክር** : **መልአክ** inasmuch that the governor marvelled” Matt. 27, 14; Mark 1, 15; seldom with the Subjunctive, e. g. Gen. 16, 10⁽²⁾: or still more frequently by **እስከ** : **ሶበ**, § 169, 8. On **እስከ** after **ሐሰ** v. § 199, d. (β) **ከመ** too may introduce the Consequence; but even in this case it takes the Subjunctive, just as in Final conditions. Accordingly it is never used for “so that” unless the Consequence has to be set forth as being also designed or necessitated, e. g. “Abraham called the place so-and-so, **ከመ** : **ይበሉ** : **ዮም** so that it is said to this day” Gen. 22, 14 (where the Greek even has *ἵνα εἰπωσι*); “is there no woman among thine own people, **ከመ** : **ትሐር** that thou shouldest be obliged to go?” Judges 14, 3; 4 Esr. 1, 28; 2, 6. Hence in particular after Verbs of *Making*, *Effecting* &c., the Subjunctive must always follow, with or without **ከመ** (§ 196, 6). “So that . . not” may be expressed by the aforesaid Conjunctions with a following **ኢ**; but when “so that . . not” is much the same as “without that” or “except”, the corresponding form in Ethiopic is **እንበለ** or **ዘእንበለ** with the Imperfect, e. g. “not a sparrow falls to the ground, **ዘእንበለ** : **ያአምር** : **አቡከመ** without your Father knowing” (‘without that your Father knows’) Matt. 10, 29; also with the Subjunctive, e. g. “how camest thou in hither, **ዘእንበለ** : **ትልበስ** : **ልብስ** : **መርፖ** without (or before) having put on a wedding-garment?” Matt. 22, 12; **ኢይወዕኦ** : **እምዛቲ** : **ሀገር** : **እንበለ** : **እሕርስ** : **ገረሀተ** : **ወእዝራኦ** : **እክለ** : **ወዘእንበለ** : **ኣብልዕ** : **ፈረስዩ** : **እምውኦ** : **ቱ** : **እክል** “I will not leave this province, without tilling the fields and sowing the grain and making my horse eat of that grain” *Chronique de Ba’eda Māryām* (ed. PERRUCHON, 1893), p. 140, l. 8 sqq. Or again, the circumstantial determination may be attached, just like other circumstantial clauses, by **እንዘ** : **ኢ**, or by asyndetic apposition of the secondary clause by means of **ኢ** (v.

(1) Cf. حَتَّى.

(2) And, besides, not in all the manuscripts.

§ 200), or even by **ወኢ** and nothing more, as in: **የሀይሉ ሥዕርተ፡ ወኢይስሕቱ** “they hit a hair without missing” Judges 20, 16.

(c) Causal
Clauses.

(c) *Causal Clauses* are attached by the Conjunction **እስመ** “because”, v. *supra* § 200. So too, after Verbs of *Feeling*, the ground and occasion of the emotion are usually introduced in Ethiopic by **እስመ**, e. g. **ተፈሥሐ ፡ እስመ ፡ ተበልዑ** “he rejoiced that they were eaten” Hen. 89, 58; **ኢትሕዝኑ ፡ እስመ** “be not ye sad, because” Hen. 102, 5; 89, 67 &c. **በእንተ ፡ ዘ** or **በእንተ** with the Infinitive may also appear instead of **እስመ**, v. e. g. Gen. 6, 6, 7.

In the various clauses which are introduced by Relative conjunctions, and which have been described above, under Nos. 1 and 2,—this or that word which requires to be emphasised may be placed before the introductory conjunction of the clause, (just as in the attributive Relative-clauses, § 202, 4), e. g. **ርኢከዎሙ ፡ ካዕበ ፡ ከመ ፡ ስሕቱ** “I saw . . . that they were again going astray” Hen. 89, 51; Gen. 47, 19 &c. In the same way when the clause which is introduced by the conjunction is part of a Relative clause, a portion of the words belonging to the former must precede the conjunction, e. g. **ምድር ፡ እንተ ፡ መሐልኩ ፡ ከመ ፡ አሀብኩሙ** “the land, which I have sworn to give you” Judges 2, 1; **ሕዝብ ፡ እለ ፡ እቤ ፡ ከመ ፡ አውፅአሙ** Judges 2, 3 &c. Farther, § 190 should again be called to mind here: When,—after Verbs which may govern a double Accusative, such as Verbs of *Recognising*, *Declaring*, *Making* &c.—the second Object is expressed by a clause of its own with a Relative conjunction, it is then more elegant to put the first Object in the principal clause as the Object of that clause, instead of bringing it into the dependent clause as Subject of the same, e. g. **ርእየ ፡ ኖኅ ፡ ምድረ ፡ ከመ ፡ አድነነት** ⁽¹⁾ “Noah saw that the earth was drawing to a close” Hen. 65, 1; 83, 4; or, if that Object be indeed attracted into the dependent clause as its Subject, it must at least be placed before the conjunctions, as in **ርእየ ፡ ነሐሙ ፡ ኃጥአን ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይሰድዱ** Hen. 41, 2; 89, 40; 95, 1 &c.

3. Compa-
rative
Clauses.

§ 204. 3. *Comparative Clauses*. The Conjunctions **ከመ**, **በከመ**, **ዘከመ** are employed to introduce a *Comparison*, and also **ከመ ፡ እንተ** before feminine Nouns, e. g. John 1, 32; Ps. 143, 14. The *Clause of Comparison* may be joined to another clause; and

(1) [FLEMMING prefers the alternative form of the verb, **አጽነነት**. TR.]

in that case it is not essential that this latter clause should contain a reference, in the shape of a Demonstrative, to the Relative Conjunction, *e. g.* **ዘሰትየ : ከመ : ይሰቲ : ከልብ** “he who drinketh, as a dog drinketh” Judges 7, 5; 16, 9; Gen. 6, 22; Matt. 20, 27 *sq.*; Hen. 27, 5. But if the Clause with the Relative Conjunction comes first, then a corresponding Demonstrative is generally placed at the head of the following clause, *v. infra* § 206. Of course the Conjunction of Comparison may also come before other Conjunctions, *e. g.* **ከመ : ሰባ** “just as when” Judges 15, 14. On the other hand our expression “as if” or “just as if” has often a personal turn given it in Ethiopic, *viz.* “as he who”, *e. g.* **ወነሱኖ : (ለአንበሳ) ከመ : ዘይነሱኖ : ማኅሥኦ : ጠሊ**, “and he rent it (the lion), as one who rendeth a kid” Judges 14, 6; Gen. 41, 21; 42, 30.

For comparing Intensive Clauses the same particle **እምነ** (or **እም**) usually suffices, which we have already become acquainted with as serving this purpose (§ 187, 3). **እምነ** in fact is used, not only when the Verb of the clause compared may be expressed in the Infinitive, but also when it is put in a finite tense. As examples of the first case we have **ይሄይስ : ተአምኖ : በእግዚአብሔር : እምተአምኖ : በእንሰ : እመሕያው** “it is better to trust in God than to trust in man” Ps. 117, 8, 9; Ruth 1, 12. In such a case it is not even imperative that **እምነ** should stand immediately before the Infinitive, *e. g.* “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, **እምባዕል : በዊኦ : መንግሥተ : እግዚአብሔር** than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God” Matt. 19, 24. The Infinitive may even be left out altogether, *e. g.* **ይሄይስኒ : ለከ : አሁብ : እምነ : ለካልኦ : ብእሲ** “it is better for me that I give (her) to thee than to another man” Gen. 29, 19. In the second case **እምነ** is to be regarded, in accordance with § 168, as a Construct State, on which the entire following clause depends⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* **ሊተሰ : ይሄይስኒ : መዊት : እምይትበህነኒ : ምዝጋኖ** 1 Cor. 9, 15; **ቦኑ : ይሄይስከ : ትኩን : ከህነ : ለ፩ብእሲ : እምነ : ትኩን : ከህነ : ለነገድ** Judges 18, 19; John 11, 50; 12, 43. Nor in this case is it essential that the Verb should immediately follow **እምነ**. On the contrary individual words or even clauses may intervene: **ይሄይስከ : ከመ : ይትሐገቡል : ፩እምነ : አባልከ : እምኩሉ : ሥጋከ : ይትወደይ : ውስ**

(1) = **እምነዝ** = **ዘእምነ** (§ 202, 2), which likewise occurs, although not often, *e. g.* Gen. 4, 13.

ተ፡ ገገኖ “it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish than (that) thy whole body should be cast into Gehenna” Matt. 5, 29, 30; “it is better for thee that thou shouldest enter into life halt or maimed **አምአንዝ፡ ብከ፡ ክልኤ፡ እደ፡ . . . ትትወደደ፡ ውስተ፡ እሳት** than that, as one having two hands . . . thou shouldest be cast into the fire” Matt. 18, 8.

4. Temporal
Clauses.

4. *Temporal Clauses*. Subsidiary actions, which accompany or precede the main action, may be expressed in Ethiopic by the Gerund, whether they have or have not the same Subject as the principal clause, and whether the temporal clause comes before or after the principal clause, as also whether the action is completed or not; v. § 181.

This construction, however, is not always convenient, least of all when the subsidiary action occupies a clause of considerable length. Ethiopic has accordingly developed additional relative Conjunctions to indicate the same Time-references which may be expressed by the Gerund, particularly the references “after”, “when”, “in the time that”, “while”. The other references, such as “still”, “before”, “since”, “so long as” &c. can in any case be expressed only by Conjunctions. All the temporal clauses, introduced by such conjunctions, are to be viewed as clauses dependent upon, or supported by, the principal clause, although it is not absolutely necessary to place them after that clause: they may also be inserted within it, or even put before it. Several of them,—especially those which are introduced by “when”, “as soon as”, “so long as”,—occasionally possess the force of a Conditional sentence (v. § 205). Of the Temporal conjunctions which are enumerated in § 170, **አምድጎረ**, **አምአመ**, **አምዘ**, which answer in some degree to our “after” and “since”, are, naturally, joined to the Perfect, *e. g.* Gen. 5, 4 *sqq.*; Matt. 2, 13; Gen. 11, 10; 24, 32; Ex. 19, 1; 40, 15; Deut. 2, 16 &c. **ሶበ**⁽¹⁾ and **አመ**, for “when” or “as”, may take a verb either in the Perfect or the Imperfect, according to the context, *e. g.* Gen. 6, 1; 39, 15; Ps. 2, 5; Hen. 10, 12; Gen. 11, 10;

(1) In the ‘Synaxarion’ the apodosis, after **ሶበ** is often introduced by **ወ**; v. the examples given in *Chrest.*, pp. 24, 26; [v. farther *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XIX; *Contentings of the Apostles* 214, 13 *sq.*; 154, 27 *sq.*; v. also, as an instance of the sequence **አምድጎረ፡ . . . ወ**, *ibid.* 215, 1 *sq.*; and of the sequence **ወ . . . ወ**, **ወርእዮ፡ ሐዋርያ፡ ወደቤሎሙ** *ibid.* 371, 16 *sq.*; *cf.* also 14, 16.]

Hen. 25, 4. It is the same with **አምከመ** “as soon as” (also “when”): *e. g.* it is found with the Perfect in Gen. 30, 42; Numb. 21, 9; with a Perfect in a Future relation (Future Perfect) in Gen. 12, 12; Lev. 14, 34; Deut. 2, 25; Matt. 9, 21; 21, 24; and with the Imperfect in Matt. 5, 23. The very same constructions are also found with **እስከ** : **አመ**, **መጠነ**, **አምጣነ** “as long as”, *e. g.* Hen. 93, 3; Cant. 3, 5; Matt. 9, 15; Lev. 13, 46; Judges 18, 31; Mark 2, 19; Gal. 4, 1. On the other hand the Conjunction **እንዘ** (our “while” with regular tense, or “in” or “by” with the Participle),—seeing that almost invariably it introduces a circumstance or situation, falling within the time of the main action,—is chiefly construed with the Imperfect, in accordance with § 89. It occurs in this connection very frequently indeed,—in fact, nearly as often as the Participle in Greek, or *indem* and *während* in German, *e. g.* Matt. 9, 35; 13, 13; 17, 3, 14; 18, 1; Luke 9, 29, 56; 11, 27; Gen. 29, 9. The occurrence of a Perfect after **እንዘ** is confined almost entirely to those verbs which of themselves suggest a state, condition, or circumstance, like **ሀለወ** itself for instance, as in Ps. 21, 9. This **እንዘ** may often too be translated by “although”, *e. g.* in Luke 22, 53 (“although I was daily with you”: E. V. “When I was &c.”), particularly if it is preceded or followed by a Negative, when it may sometimes be rendered by “without”, *e. g.* **ሀይማኖት** **ወይን** **እንዘ** : **አምከ** : **አመ** : **ወ-አቱ** : **ለሁሉ** “even though he be lord of all” Gal. 4, 1; 4 Esr. 8, 67; **እንዘ** : **አይፈቅድ** “though he consent not” (“without his consent”). With a similar force to that of **እንዘ**, **በዘ** is also used, v. § 170, 9; but yet the latter leans more to the meaning “even in the case that”, *i. e.* “in spite of the fact or circumstance that”, “notwithstanding that”, “even although”. It would be well, besides, to compare with this section § 200, according to which Circumstantial Clauses may even be expressed by asyndetic apposition or be introduced by **ወ**.—The Conjunctions **እንበለ**, **ዘእንበለ**, **አምቅድመ** “sooner than”, “before”, are joined to the Subjunctive, in accordance with § 90, *e. g.* Gen. 11, 4; 19, 4; Judges 14, 18; Gen. 24, 15; Matt. 6, 8; 26, 34; Ps. 38, 17; Hen. 9, 11; 48, 3; Gen. 2, 5; Hen. 48, 6⁽¹⁾; but yet the construction with the Infinitive is also possible, *e. g.* Matt. 15, 20.—Lastly, **እስከ** “until”, may, according

(¹) FLEMMING here adopts the reading **ዘእንበለ**, while DILLMANN has **አምቅድመ**. TR.]

to the particular connection, take the verb in the Perfect, as, for instance, in Matt. 12, 22; Gen. 8, 7; Hen. 13, 7; or in the Imperfect, *e. g.* Matt. 5, 18; 12, 20; Hen. 10, 12, 17; 19, 1. It is the same with አስከ : አመ or አስከ : ሶበ “till the time that”, “until”, *e. g.* Matt. 2, 9, 13; 16, 28; Gen. 39, 16; Judges 13, 7; 18, 30; Ps. 122, 3. It has been already remarked (§ 203, 2, *b*) that the signification of the three last-named Conjunctions often passes over into the meaning “so that”.

3. RECIPROCAL SENTENCES AND WORDS.

(a) CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

General
Description.
Particles
and Tenses
employed in
Protasis and
Apodosis:—

§ 205. Conditional Sentences are by their very nature double sentences; and in them one constituent of the double sentence lays down a supposition, under which the assertion of the other is realisable. No doubt there are conditional statements in which the Condition is not expressly mentioned; but these are incomplete and abbreviated sentences, which can always be developed into full sentences of two members each: farther, they must contain some hint or other, that the assertion is only to be understood conditionally.—In these double sentences the clause expressing the hypothesis usually precedes the clause containing the consequence or result; but yet inversion of that order may occur, if it is demanded by circumstances otherwise found in the context. In that case the main assertion is put first; and afterwards, by the attachment of a Condition, it is made to depend upon something else. The conditional character of the assertion is denoted generally by special conditional-particles. A Conditional Sentence may of course be found without such express marking; but it is not a common occurrence in Ethiopic. The hypothesis may be laid down, and the consequence associated therewith, either by the **ወ** of sequence, or by asyndetic apposition. Examples of the first mode may be found in § 200; and as examples of the second the following may be taken: አ.ሀሎኩ : በሥጋ : ሀሎኩ : በመንፈስ “if I am not in the body, yet am I in the spirit” (*Org.*); አጌልፋሙ : አምኖ፡ ይበዝኑ. “if I count them, they are more than the sand”

Ps. 138, 17⁽¹⁾. Ordinarily, however, conditional particles are made use of, and in fact **አመ** (**ለአመ**) and **ሶበ** for the Protasis, the former being employed to introduce those conditions in which some pre-supposition is simply advanced as such, without regard to its reality or its possibility, and the latter for those conditions in which the speaker makes a supposition which seems to him impossible or improbable. According as the hypothesis is introduced with the one or the other of these conditional particles, the Apodosis in turn is introduced in different ways. Hence, in farther dealing with the subject, we have to distinguish between two kinds of Conditional Sentences. Relative Clauses also approximate occasionally, in point of effect, to Conditional Clauses, *e. g.* **ለዘክላ ደኒ፡ እክሕዶ፡ አነሂ** “whoever denies me (= ‘if any one denies me’), him will I deny (= ‘then I will deny him’)” Matt. 10, 33. So also is it at times with Temporal Clauses, *e. g.* **መንፈሶሙ፡ በማእከሉሙ፡ ትጸንዕ፡ ሶበ፡ ርእይዎ፡ ለኅሩዩ፡ ዚአዩ** “their spirit will become strong within them, when they see my chosen one” Hen. 45, 3⁽²⁾; Gen. 38, 9; for not only is **ሶበ** a temporal conjunction as well as a conditional particle, but even **አመ** “if” is connected with **አመ** “when” (§ 170, 1).—Both in Sentences stipulating a realisable condition, and in those which merely approximate that description, the action given in the Protasis must in general be completed, or at least begun, if the consequence is to make its appearance. For that reason precisely, the tense which is commonly employed in the Protasis of a Conditional Sentence is the Perfect, inasmuch as it is made use of not only when the required condition actually falls within the Past, but even when it occurs in the Present, or belongs to the Future, in the guise of a Future Perfect. And yet we are not altogether restricted to the use of the Perfect in the Protasis, but in certain circumstances we may employ the Imperfect, or even have a Clause without any verb (§ 194). Upon the whole, Ethiopic exhibits much closer agreement with Hebrew than with Arabic, in its mode of dealing with the tenses of such clauses.

1. In *Simple Conditional Sentences*,—*i. e.*, Sentences, in

(¹) [But these last two examples can hardly be called Conditional Sentences. They are rather Temporal Sentences, and belong much more properly to the preceding Section, § 204, 4. TR.]

(²) [FLEMMING's reading here varies slightly:—**ኅሩሶሙ፡ . . . ርእይዎሙ፡ ለኅሩዩን፡ ዚአዩ**. TR.]

1. In Simple
Conditional
Sentences.

which a supposition is laid down without regard to its actual existence or its possibility, and a consequence is made to depend upon it,—the Protasis is introduced by **እመ** or **ለእመ** “if” (§ 170, 1), and, when negative, by **እመ** (or **ለእመ**) **ኢ**, (or **ኣኮ**). The Apodosis may be denoted by the **ወ** of Consequence (*e. g.* 1 Cor. 5, 3; v. also § 200), or by **ወ—እንከ** “in that case—then” (*e. g.* Judges 16, 7), or by **እንከ** alone (*e. g.* Judges 16, 11). That is not absolutely necessary, however; and in by far the greater number of cases, it is introduced without any outward marking. For “even if” or “although” **እመ** may suffice; but the more accurate expression is **እመኒ** or **እመኒ**⁽¹⁾, *e. g.* Ps. 22, 4; Is. 49, 15; Hen. 100, 5; Matt. 26, 35, without any antithetical particle (“yet”) being made use of in the Apodosis (§ 200, 2)⁽²⁾. If now the action or circumstance, which forms the Condition, lies in the circle of the Future,—the usual case in these Simple Conditional Sentences,—it generally stands in the Perfect (which here has the force of the Future-Perfect, § 88). In that case the action of the Apodosis likewise falls in the Future or at the utmost in the Present, and in either case it is expressed by means of the Imperfect, *e. g.* **እመ : ኅደኅ : ይመወት** “if he leaves him (‘will leave him’), then he dies (‘he will die’)” Gen. 44, 22; 28, 20, 21; **በምንት : እመ : አሰሩከ : ትደክም** “wherewith thou shalt become weak, if they bind thee therewith” Judges 16, 6; Matt. 18, 3; 26, 35; **ከማሁ : አቡየኒ : ይገብር : ለክሙ : እመ : ኢኅደግሙ : ለቢጽክሙ** “so likewise shall my Father do unto you, if ye forgive not your neighbour” Matt. 18, 34; **ምንተ : ይበቀሥ : ለሰብእ : ለእመ : ነሎ : ዓለመ : ረብሐ** “what shall it profit a man, if he gain (will have gained) the whole world?” Matt. 16, 26; Gen. 38, 16⁽³⁾. And yet, in this case also, an Imperfect

(1) On **እንከ : ኢ** “although”, v. § 204, 4.

(2) [*Cf.* **እመኒ : ተምዕዐ : ኢደዐርብ : ፀሐይ : በመዐቱ** “even when (‘though’) he did become angry, the sun did not go down upon his wrath” *Chronique de Galāwdēwos* p. 58, l. 4 sq.; *cf.* also the following passage, giving **ኒ** appended to the Subject of the Apodosis, and presenting farther a curious involution:—**እስመ : ነፍስከኒ : እመኒ : ሞተ : ሥጋ : ኢትመውት** “for even though the body dies, thy soul dies not”. *Das äthiopische Maccabäerbuch* (J. HOROVITZ in ‘*Zeitschrift f. Assyr.*’, 1906) p. 229, l. 31. TR.]

(3) [*Cf.* **ወአማን : እመ : ዐርገ : ኅይል : ወሞአ : አእምር : ከመ : ፍትሐ : እግዚአብሔር** “and truly if a force should come up and be victori-

may occur in the Protasis, *e. g.* **ለእመ : እስከ : ሰማይ : ትትሌዐሊ :**
እስከ : ገሃነም : ትወርዱ Matt. 11, 23, where, evidently, the hyper-
 bolical nature of the expression induced the translator to apply
 the tense, not of actual past occurrence, but of that which was
 possible only, or merely thought of (almost in the meaning:—‘al-
 though thou *shouldst* be exalted’): **ኢንክል : ለእመ : ኢይትጋብኡ**
 “we cannot, until (the shepherds) have come together” Gen. 29, 8
 (where **ለእመ : ኢ** is almost equivalent to **ዘእንበለ**)⁽¹⁾. But if the
 action which forms the condition falls in the Past, the Perfect alone
 is available, *e. g.* **ለእመ : ተለወ : ልብየ : ብእሲተ : ብእሲ : ወእመ :**
ወሐይኩ : ጥኅተ : ቤታ : ብእሲትየኒ : ተክድሞ : ለካልእ : ብእሲ
 Job 31, 9: yet in such a case **እመሰ**, in the sense of “if really”, is
 preferred to **እመ**, *e. g.* **እመሰ : ከመዝ : ገበርኩ : . . . ለያውድቄኒ :**
ጸላእትየ Ps. 7, 3, 4. If farther the action of the Apodosis also be-
 longs to the past, it is likewise expressed by the Perfect, *e. g.* **እ**
መሰኬ : ደቂቅከ : አበሱ : ቅድሜሁ : ወፈነወ : በእደ : ኅጢአቶሙ
 “if thy children have verily incurred guilt before him, he has de-
 livered (them) over to the consequences of their transgressions”
 Job 8, 4; and thus also John 18, 23; Rom. 6, 5; Col. 3, 1. Lastly,
 if the action of the Condition belongs to the Present, the Imper-
 fect, or a circumstantial clause with the force of the Present, ap-
 pears in the Protasis; and in this case too **እመሰ** is often found
 instead of **እመ**, *e. g.* **እመሰ : ይትከህል : ይኅልፍ** “if it is possible,
 —let it pass by” Matt. 26, 39; **ያድኅኖ : እመ : ይፈቅዶ** “let him
 save him, if he have pleasure in him” Matt. 27, 43; **እመሰ : ወልደ :**
እግዚአብሔር : አንተ : ረድ : እመስቀልከ Matt. 27, 40, 42; **ወእመ**
ሰ : ንጹሓን : ደቅከ : እምአንስት : ለይብልዑ 1 Sam. 21, 4; although
 an Inchoative verb may also stand in the Perfect: **እመ : ርኅብኩ :**

ous, know that it is the judgment of God” *Homilia Jacobi* (ed. FR. PEREIRA, in
 ‘*Oriental. Studien*’, 1906) p. 892, l. 4 sq. TR.]

⁽¹⁾ [Cf. **ወለእመ : ንሴአል : እስላመ : ወአይሁደ : ከመዝ : ከመ :**
ይፈትሑ : በከመ : ሃይማኖቶሙ “and if we put the question to Moham-
 medans or Jews, they too will give a like answer, in accordance with their
 faith” *Hatātā Zar’a Yā’qōb* (ed. TURAEFF, St. Petersburg, 1904) p. 9, l. 12 sq.
 = *Philosophi Abessini* (ed. LITTMANN, Leipzig, 1904) p. 7, l. 21 sq. (except that
 LITTMANN reads **እስላም : ወአይሁድ**); cf. also **ለእመ : ኢያምጸእክም**
ዎሙ : ለእሉ : እደው : መቃብያን : ንሕነ : ናውዕያ : ለሀገርክሙ “if
 you do not produce these men, the Maqābīs, we will burn down your city”
Das äthiopische Maccabäerbuch p. 199, l. 11 sq. TR.]

ኢይስኢክ “if I be hungry (‘have become hungry’) I will not beg from thee” Ps. 49, 13. Even if the action of the Protasis is one which is repeated several times, and such that **እመ** is equivalent to “as often as”, the Perfect is still the better form, *e. g.* **እመ : ርኢክ : ሰራቄ : ትረውጽ : ምስሌሁ** “when thou seest a thief, thou dost run with him” Ps. 49, 19; 45, 2. Sometimes also the interrogative particles **ሁ** and **ኑ** (§ 161), adopted in the Protasis, serve a like purpose with the **ስ** which is here and there appended to **እመ**—:for since the Condition is thus concomitantly put as a question, doubt must be awakened regarding it, such as is expressed in our “if really”, “if it be the fact that”, as in: **እመስ : አንተሁ : እግዚአ : አገዛዝ : እምጸእ : ኅቤክ** “Lord, if it be (indeed) thou, bid me come to thee” Matt. 14, 28; **እመ : ይጸውዑኩ : መጽኡ : እሉ : ሰብእ : ተንሥእ** “if these men have (actually) come to call thee, arise!” Numb. 22, 20; *cf.* also **ለእመሁ** Acts 16, 15.

On rare occasions **እመ** is abbreviated into **እም**, *e. g.* **ምንት ኑ : ኄር : ዘእምገበርኩ : ሕይወተ : ዘለዓለም : በዘ : እወርስ** “what is the good thing, the which if I do, I shall thereby gain eternal life?” Matt. 19, 16.

When two Conditional Sentences appear, the one after the other, and the second of them states negatively the presupposition, which is put affirmatively in the first, it is not obligatory to repeat the entire Protasis in the second. It is then quite sufficient to say **ወእመ : አኮ (ወእማእኮ) or ወእማእኮስ** “and if not”, “if otherwise”, *e. g.* **ወለእመስ : ትገብሩ : ምሕረተ : ላዕለ : እግዚእየ : ንግሩኒ : ወእማእኮ : እትመዩዋ** “if ye now (indeed) will show kindness to my lord, tell me, but if not, then will I turn . .” Gen. 24, 49; Ex. 32, 32; Judges 9, 16—20. And this phraseology may be employed after any statement whatever, —and not merely after conditional sentences,—in order to add a representation of what will happen if the action which has just been mentioned is not realised, *e. g.* “take heed that ye do not your alms before men . . **ወእመአኮስ : ዐስበ : አልብክሙ** otherwise, ye have no reward” Matt. 6, 1; Mark 2, 21; Luke 14, 32; Josh. 22, 22.

“Except” or “unless” is rendered by **ዘእንበለ** (§ 170, 4), if no new verb follows, *e. g.* Matt. 19, 9; but if it is followed by a new verb, it takes the form **ዘእንበለ : እመ**, “except (that), “unless (that)” *e. g.* Matt 12, 29; or **ዘእንበለ** with the Subjunctive, *e. g.* Matt. 5, 32.

On “just as if”, “just as when” v. § 204, 3. “However much” is **አመ : ሚመጠነ**, e. g. Eccles. 8, 17. “If only . . . not”, “provided that . . . not”, as a particle of *uncertainty* and *fear*, is **የ-ኒ**, v. § 203, 1, a, γ.—On (**ለ**)**አመቦ** *si quis* with a following **ዘ** or **ከመ** cf. DILLMANN’s ‘Lex.’, col. 481.

2. In Unreal Conditional Sentences⁽¹⁾, the Protasis is always introduced by **ሶበ**, a particle which is often employed in Optative Clauses, “would that!” (§ 199, e)⁽²⁾. It can only be in consequence of being so employed, that it has come to be adopted as a Conditional Particle in those Conditional Sentences which present the supposition, as it were, in an Optative form. Farther, the interrogative **ሁ** or **ኑ** or the emphatic **ሰ** may be brought into use after **ሶበ**, with the same force as after **አመ**⁽³⁾. As, however, **ሶበ** is also a Temporal Conjunction (§ 204, 4), a Conditional Sentence cannot be distinguished from a Temporal one by **ሶበ** alone; and therefore the Apodosis must always be introduced by the particle **አም**⁽⁴⁾ **ፈህ** (§ 170, 2). This **አም**, the proper mark of hypothetical statement, regularly comes immediately in front of the verb of the Apodosis, and may be repeated, if the Apodosis has more than one verb. If, however, the conditioned clause comes before the conditioning one, the **አም** is in that case sometimes omitted, e. g. **ኅዩሰነ : ሶበ : ሞትነ : በብሔረ : ንብጽ : አምነ : ንሙት : በዝንቱ : ንዳም** “it (‘was’) would have been better for us if we (‘died’) had died in Egypt than that we should die in this wilderness” Numb. 14, 2; **ለአስሕቶ : ሶበሰ : ይትከሀሉሙ : ለኅሩያንሂ** “to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect” Matt. 24, 24 (where **አም** is wanting, because it cannot stand between the Preposition and the Infinitive); cf. also G. Ad. 48, 7; [*Chrest.*, p. 86, l. 13 *sqq.*, and *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XX. For a remarkable use of **አም** in an auxiliary clause attached to the Apodosis of such a sentence, v. *Kebra Nag.* 129 a 20 *sqq.*].

2. In Unreal Conditional Sentences.

(1) [—i. e. Sentences in which the Condition is obviously unrealisable. — TR.]

(2) Like ነገ, ንገ.

(3) [Occasionally, however, **ሶበ** is also replaced by **ለአመ**; v. PRAETORIUS, ‘*Aethiop. Gramm.*’ p. 151, l. 3; and by **ሶበ : አመ**, cf. BEZOLD, *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XX].

(4) Originally **አመ**, which still appears now and then, e. g. 4 Esr. 3, 54 (also v. 55 in one Manuscript); 7, 20; Tobit 10, 5; [*Contendings of the Apostles* 15, 6; 151, 25. Cf. also *Kebra Nag.*, *Introd.* p. XX].

With respect to the Tenses of Unreal Conditional Sentences it is to be observed that the Perfect prevails almost universally, both in the Protasis and the Apodosis. The Ethiopian says: "if thou didst this, then I did that"; and by the identity of Tense in the Protasis and Apodosis he at first gives expression to the circumstance merely that the two clauses exactly correspond to each other, and that the second indubitably results from the first. A conviction, however, is always found inseparably associated with this class of Conditional Sentences,—that the instances which they describe have no reality in them. Farther, this conviction can only be thoroughly relied upon, we may say, in the case of things which belong to the Past or the completed Present. Accordingly it is easy to explain why the Perfect should be used in this case,—a tense which is precisely in place, where the question turns upon occurrences which have passed away, or upon those which are completed, though not yet out of view (§ 88). But it is only from the connection or context that we can determine whether such a Perfect in an Unreal Conditional Sentence belongs truly to the circle of the Past, the Present or the Future, and whether the Protasis is concerned with the same sphere of time as the Apodosis. The connection, however, is generally sufficient to enable us so to determine: only in rare cases may there be a lingering doubt whether the Optative of the Past or of the Present should be adopted in translation,—in fact in those cases only, we may say, in which the clause concerned is just as true or as false, whether we refer it to the sphere of the Past or the Present. Accordingly we say in Ethiopic: **ሶበ : ነገርከኒ : እምፈነ ውኩከ** "if thou hadst told me, I would have sent thee away" Gen. 31, 27; Matt. 23, 30; Gen. 31, 42; Judges 14, 18; Matt. 11, 21; Numb. 22, 29, 33⁽¹⁾; but also: **ሶበሁ : ተውህበ : ሕግ : ዘይክል : አሕይዎ** **በውአቱ : ሕግ : እምኮነ : ጽድቅ** "if a law had really been given which could give life, righteousness would be by that law" Gal. 3, 21; **እምኮነ : ይሰሪ : ሎቱ** "he would forgive him" G. Ad. 90, 18; **ሶበ : አሕየውክምዎሙ : እምኢቀተልኩክሙ** "if ye had allowed them to live, I would not (now) put you to death" Judges 8, 19; Matt. 26, 24; Ps. 50, 17,—all being cases, in which the presup-

(¹) In the three last-quoted passages **ወድኡ** is not employed to refer the whole sentence to the past (after the manner of **ἄν**), but is merely a translation of *παλάαι, ἤδη, νῦν*.

position belongs to the past, but the consequence to the present; or **ሶበ : ፈቀደ : ይቅጥለን** :— **እምኢተመጠወ** “if he had desired to kill us (now, or at some future time), he would not have accepted” Judges 13, 23, where the converse relation appears⁽¹⁾; or, lastly: **ሶበ : አኮሁ : ዘኅጸራ : እማንቱ : መዋዕል : አልቦ : ዘእምድኅን : መኑሂ** “if these (coming) days were not to be shortened, there should no man be saved” Matt. 24, 22, where the entire action, conditioning and conditioned, belongs to the future. On the other hand, in passages like Ps. 80, 12 sq.; 43, 22 sq.,—where the Protasis belongs to the past,—it is really a matter of doubt whether the Apodosis should be understood as being also of the past or as being of the present.

Only on very rare occasions does an Imperfect appear in the Protasis, instead of a Perfect; and even then **እም** with the Perfect is found in the Apodosis, *e. g.* in a proposition stating some universal truth, valid for any time: **ሶበ : ያአምርሁ : ባዕለ : ቤት : ጊዜ : ይመጽእ : ሰራቂ : እምተግህ : ወኢእምኅደገ : ይትከረይ : ቤቱ** “if the master of the house had actually known at what time the thief would come, he would (assuredly) have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken into” Matt. 24, 43: *cf.* also **ሶበ : አኮ : ያአምሩ** “if they did not know” G. Ad. 97, 19. A Nominal Clause occurs as Protasis in *Chrest.* p. 6, line 13 sqq.: **ሶበ : አኮ : ብእሲ : ልሂቅ : አንተ : እምጸዕልኩክ : . . . ሶበ : አኮ : ዘከመዝ : እምእቤ** and in G. Ad. 97, 12 sq. **ወሶበ : አኮ : አንተ : ቡገቤየ : ክቡር : እምኢኮንኩ**.

In Unreal Conditional Sentences the Condition is frequently left unexpressed, as being a matter obvious from the connection; and the only announcement made is as to what must have happened if some (unexpressed) condition had been realised. It is all the more necessary that a merely hypothetical announcement of this kind should be introduced by **እም**,—always a sure sign that the clause must be translated in our languages by the Optative or the Conjunctive, *e. g.* **ወደእዚኒ : እምክህልኩ : ገቢረ : እኩየ : ላዕሌከ** “and now I might be able to do thee harm” Gen. 31, 29; **መኑ : እምዜነዎ : ለአብርሃም** “who would have said to Abraham?” Gen.

(1) [—that is to say, where the presupposition (according to DILLMANN) belongs to the present or future, and the inferred fact or circumstance to the past. DILLMANN seems to be wrong here: It is not ‘the killing’ but ‘the desiring to kill’ which forms the presupposition in this case; and this desire—in its origin at least—belongs to the past, and is thought of as preceding ‘the accepting’. *TR.*]

21, 7; [**እፎ : ፈድፋድ : እምተፈሣሕከ** “how much more wouldst thou rejoice!” *Kebra Nag.* 56 b 7]; **ዘእምተሠይጠ : በብዙኅ** “a thing which might have been sold for much” *Matt.* 26, 9; 16, 26; 25, 27 &c.; and even **ሶበ : እምኦፊረረኒ** “even if he should rest” (which does not happen) *Sir.* 34, 4⁽¹⁾.

Seeing that in this way **እም** has the power of giving a hypothetical colouring to a sentence, it is often used also in Optative Sentences (§ 199, e). In a similar way it stands constantly in the phrase **ሕቀ : ከመ : ዘእም** with the Perfect, *haud multum abfuit quin*, i. e. “had nearly” (with the past part. of accompanying verb) or “came near” (with the pres. part.), e. g. **ሕቀ : ከመ : ዘእምሰከበ** “one had nearly lain” (or “came near lying”) *Gen.* 26, 10; *Ps.* 72, 2; 118, 87.

(b) CORRELATED CLAUSES AND WORDS.

§ 206. Single Words or groups of words, as well as single Clauses, may, by means of various formulae and turns of speech, be brought into such a correlated connection with one another, that each of them postulates the other, and of itself points to the other. Of these formulae the following are to be noted:

1. “Both—and”, or, negatively, “neither—nor”. Such a formula is represented in a few instances by **ወ—ወ—ወ**, e. g. *Gen.* 33, 1; but oftener by **ሂ : ወ**, e. g. **እሙንቱሂ : ወኮሉ : አሕዛቢሆሙ** *Josh.* 10, 5; or by **ሂ : ወ—ሂ**, e. g. **ነበበሂ : ወርእየሂ** *Matt.* 12, 22; or by **ኒ : ወ—ኒ** *Josh.* 11, 4; *Ps.* 48, 2; *John* 2, 15; *Hen.* 28, 2; *Gen.* 24, 25; *Mark* 3, 32, 35 (three times); *Rom.* 1, 14 (four times); or by **ኒ : ወ**, e. g. *Matt.* 12, 3; or by **ሂ : ወ—ኒ** *Gen.* 42, 35. All these combinations may also be used with negatives. *Cf. supra*, § 197, *ad fin.*

2. “As—so”. In Ethiopic **በከመ**, **ከመ**, **ዘከመ**, **ከመ : እንተ** on the one part, and **ከማሁ** or **ከመዝ** on the other, bring complete clauses,—but, for the most part, only complete clauses,—into this particular form of correlation to each other, e. g. *Judges* 15, 11;

⁽¹⁾ [*Cf.* cases in which the Protasis is given in a much abbreviated form,—sometimes by one word, such as **እንበለዝ** “without this”, “but for this”, “if this had not been”, e. g.: **ወእንበለዝ : ፍጥረተ : ሰብእ : እምኮነ : ንቱን : ወእምኢረከበ : ኮሎ : ዘይተፈቀድ : ሎቱ** “if it had not been for this (disposition), the nature of man would have been imperfect, and would have failed to obtain a supply of its various wants” *Hatatā Zar’a Yā’qōb* p. 19, l. 20 sq. = *Philosophi Abessini* p. 15, l. 18 sq. TR.]

Numb. 5, 4: Deut. 8, 5; Matt. 12, 40; 13, 40; Hen. 98, 4; Matt. 24, 17. It is only in a few cases that single words or phrases are dealt with in this fashion, and in these cases the second member of the combination (**ከማሁ**) may even be left out, *e. g.* **ከመ : መንገለ : መስዕ : መንገለ : ዐረብ** Hen. 28, 3. **በከመ : —ወ—ኒ** also occurs, Matt. 6, 10. “*The more,—the more*” or “*so much the more*” is expressed by **በአምጣነ** (*cf.* § 166, No. 35) with **ከማሁ** following, *e. g.* **በአምጣነ : ዕበይክ : ከማሁ : አትሕት : ርእሰክ** (‘according to the measure of thy greatness, so do thou humble thyself’) “the greater thou art, be thou the more humble” Sir. 3, 18; **በአምጣነ : ይሣቅይዎሙ : ከማሁ : ይበዝኑ** “the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied” Ex. 1, 12. Farther, **ከመ** with some word following, expressive of *multitude*, together with **ከማሁ**—may represent this idea, as in **ከመ : ብዙኑ : ውዕዩ : ሥጋሆሙ : ከመዝ : ሦሙ : ተውላዎ : ለመንፈስ** “the more their body burns, the greater change passes over their spirit” Hen. 67, 9⁽¹⁾.

3. **μὲν—δέ**, for which Ethiopic has no special form,—is sometimes not translated at all, and is sometimes translated by **ኒ** set in the second clause. The most adequate rendering, however, is given by **ስ** in the first part and **ወ** in the introduction of the second (v. § 200, 2).

4. “*Either—or*”, in the sense of “*sive—sive*”, is given in Ethiopic by **አመኒ : —ወአመኒ**, or **አመኒ : —ወአመኒ**. Both of these forms are used, and frequently, not only to correlate individual words, *e. g.* **አመኒ : ሕይወት : ወአመኒ : ሞት** 1 Cor. 3, 22 (repeated as many as eight times), Lev. 3, 1, Matt. 5, 37, but even to introduce two complete Conditional Sentences, which have to be confronted antithetically with one another, Luke 20, 5 *sq.*; Ps. 138, 7. If on the other hand the two sentences have to be exclusive of one another (“*aut—aut*”), then recourse is had to **አማእከ** or **አማእከ** and **ወአማእከ** or **ወአማእከ**, *e. g.* Gen. 13, 9; 24, 29; Lev. 1, 14; Josh. 24, 15; Matt. 6, 24; 12, 33.

The Letter of Cyril to John may serve as an instance of specially involved Periods: *cf.* *Chrest.* p. 75, lines 2—7; 21—25; p. 76, lines 15—21.

(¹) [FLEMMING’s reading here is **ተውላጦ : በመንፈስ**. TR.]

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

- P. 1, l. 4. The date generally accepted now, for the conversion of Abyssinia to Christianity, may be given as—the middle of the *fourth* century.
- P. 13, l. 17 *sqq.* DILLMANN'S strictures on the neglect of Ethiopic, however much they may have been deserved when the '*Grammar*' was first published, are happily without application to the present position of the study.
- P. 17, l. 12. *Tait*—should be printed—*Tait*—, as the last letter of this alphabetical name is not emphatic. In like manner, farther on in this section,—*Haut*—should be—*Haut*—, and—*Pait*—should be—*Pait*.
- P. 23, Note (¹), l. 3. Insert after the word—now—the following:—, at least in grammatical treatises on Ethiopic (v. PRAETORIUS' '*Aethiop. Gramm.*', *passim*),—.
- P. 25, Note (¹). Add at the end of the Note, and within the brackets, the following:—At the same time, it is true that Inscriptions do exist, which are only *half-vocalised*.—.
- P. 27, l. 3 *sqq.* Instead of—along with—, read—in comparison with—.
- P. 27, Note (¹). First word of line 2 should be printed—as—.
- P. 33, Note (¹), l. 2; for—Jul.—, read—Tub.—.
- P. 42, l. 8; for—*p*-sound—, read—*p*-sound—.
- P. 43, Note (¹) *ult.*; for—p. 578—, read—p. 518 *sqq.*—.
- P. 55, l. 12; for—**፲፱፻፲**—, read—**፲፱፻፲**—.
- P. 65, l. 5; after—**o** and **h**,—, insert—**u** and **h**,—.
- P. 101, l. 4 from foot; for the head-line—1. CONSONANTS.—, read—2. CONSONANTS.—.
- P. 119, l. 2; for—how!—, read—how?—.
- P. 121, Note (²), l. 2; insert a comma (,) after **፶**.
- P. 173, l. 19;—Ps. 120, 4—should be—Ps. 120, 5—.

- P. 207, l. 4; for—*taṣe'ḥka*—, read—*taṣē'ḥka*—.
- P. 216, l. 20; for—(נל)—, read—(נל)—.
- P. 225, l. 23;—2—should be printed—(2)—.
- P. 295, l. 6;—p. 173—should be—p. 53, 16 sq.—.
- P. 317, Note (1). Add at the end of the bracketed part of the Note, and within the brackets, the following:—For a *Plural-Plural-Plural* form, v. *ibid.*, p. XXIX b: **ህህህህህህህ**.—.
- P. 321, l. 24; for—Josh. 22, 23—, read—Josh. 22, 13—.
- P. 325, Note (1) *ult.*; for—(through **ዝ**)—, read—(through **ዘ**)—.
- P. 338. Restore the Marginal words—The Second Pers. Pron.—, which have fallen out opposite line 6 sq.
- P. 346, l. 15;—*āhā*—should be printed—*ā-hā*—.
- P. 347, Note (2) *ult.*; for—S 31—, read—631—.
- P. 353, Note (3), l. 3; for—*ihu*—, read—*ihū*—.
- P. 361, l. 5 from foot: Add at the end of the line the following:—[For the combination **አስኩ : በአስፍንቱ**, v. *Philos. Abess.*, p. 9, l. 2].—.
- P. 384, l. 19; for—“frequently—, read—“frequently”—.
- P. 384, l. 24;—*καί*—should be—*καὶ*—.
- P. 415, l. 16; for—**ያበ**—, read—**ያበ**—.
- P. 431, l. 28; for—1906—, read—1905—.
- P. 481; read last word of Marginal—Substantive.
- P. 482, Note (1), l. 2; for—§ 80, *b, a*—, read—§ 80, *b, α*—.
- P. 494, l. 34; for—“nothing—, read—“and nothing—.
- P. 497, beginning of last line; for—*f*—, read—*if*—.
- P. 499, l. 2; for—Gen. 35, 37—, read—Gen. 35, 27—.
- P. 500, l. 22; for—Gen. 33, 14—, read—Gen. 39, 14—.
- P. 501, Note (1), beginning of last line; read—in—.
- P. 512, l. 31; for—‘*Lex.*—, read—‘*Lex.*’,—.
- P. 533, l. 3; for—Sir. 13, 14—, read—Sir. 13, 4—.
- P. 540, l. 3 from foot sq.; substitute for the words in parenthesis the following:—*i. e.* ‘whom say the people that the Son of Man is’ *or* ‘whom do the people take the Son of Man to be’—.

INDEX OF PASSAGES.

(THE REFERENCES ARE TO THE PAGES OF THIS EDITION).

A. SCRIPTURE.

(a) OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis (<i>Octateuchus</i> <i>Aethiopicus</i> , ed. DILL- MANN, 1853) <i>Comm.</i> , p. 5		Genesis		Genesis	
	235, 348, 402, 409	3, 13	513	6, 17	401, 470
1, 2	360	15	518	19	394
3	173, 442, 518	16	358, 428, 452, 505, 519	21	443
4	486	18	345	22	543
5	426, 439	19	498	7, 1	484
8	439, 476, 486	20	444	2	374, 535
9	358, 401	22	417, 471, 483	3	374
11	501	24	144, 462	4	371, 524
14	391, 501	4, —	321	6	443
15	391, 458	2	449	9	374
16	479, 535	4	358	10	371
21	478	7	510	11	489
24	333	8	375, 431	14	390
26	411	9	493, 514	16	394
27	273	11	357	17	190, 394
29	451	13	543	20	409, 432
31	168	14	169	21, 22	470
2, 2	450	15	372	24	398
5	174, 545	21	357	8, 1	427
6	172, 385	22	172	2	393
7	391, 398, 446	23	319	3	178
8	383	25	413, 444	4	489
9	391, 458, 474, 479	5, 2	481	6	503
17	432, 433	3	340, 432	7	515, 546
18	442, 457	4 <i>sqq.</i>	544	9	531
22	464	29	447	10	371
25	172, 360	32	499	11	404, 437, 462, 537
3, 1	394, 475	6, 1	544	12	450
3	457, 539	2	394, 485, 530	13	466, 471, 487
4	510	3	496	14	489
5	530	4	314, 462	16 <i>bis</i> , 18 <i>bis</i>	502
7	360	5	537	19	316
8	172, 404	6	420, 459, 542	20	394
9	498	7	263, 459, 542	21	472, 501
10	360	9	480	9, 2	444, 447, 502
11	510	12	399, 470, 485	6	332, 460
12	458	14	402, 434, 477	8	428
		15	427, 488	9	392
		16	391	11	458
				12	462

Genesis

9, 13	442
19	488
20	401
21	447
22	386, 484
23	147, 340, 502
26	519
27	518
10, 5	390
8	314
15	481
30	323
11, 3	442
4	173, 375, 519, 532, 545
6	454
7	519
8	472
9	279, 441, 502
10	417, 544 <i>bis</i>
28	532
29	502
12, 1	464, 465
3	501
5	428
6	436
7	246
8	404
11	481
12	506, 545
13	255, 405
17	433, 480
18	537
19	376
20	428
13, 2	465, 473, 474
4	380
7	469, 482
9	555
10	316
11	399
14	399, 465
15	363
17	467
14, 1	466
2	428, 480
3	429
4	487
5	314, 478
9	488
10	472
13	474
15	436
16	428, 439
17	440
20	373
23	303, 509, 513
24	107
15, 2	235, 374
3	374
5	418, 447
6	441

Genesis

15, 7	351
8	393
9	534
12	436, 480
13	171, 452, 487, 494, 496
16	489
17	452, 528 <i>bis</i>
16, 1	444
2	415
6	348
10	452, 467, 541
12	360, 462, 479
13	206
16	490
17, 1	490
4	478
5	441
6	486
7	323
10	498
12	223, 445
14	518
16	302
17	368, 483
20	439
23	223
24	490
18, 1	107, 432, 523
2	190, 398, 458
6	314
7	449
8	476
10	302, 432
12	387
13	379
14	302, 436
17	393
18	480
19	171
20	501
21	510, 515
22	172
24	418, 513
24 <i>sqq.</i>	487
25	387, 520
26	480
28	378, 432
31, 32	456
19, 1	172, 404, 523
2	436
4	467, 545
5	432
7	397
8	376 <i>bis</i> , 517
9	377, 436, 475
11	434, 467, 483
12	514
15	501
16	447
17 <i>bis</i>	345
18	520

Genesis

19, 19	509
20	476
30	454
31 <i>sqq.</i>	534
32	375
33	459
36	393
37	497
20, 4	523, 534
6	385
7	398
9	477
11	417
12	399
13	398
16	446
17	447
18	453
21, 2	358
5	523
7	467, 553
8	464
12	493
17	441, 447
18	348
20	441
22	353
23	445
28	363
30	398
22, 1	376
4	489
6	463
7	320
9	398
11	376
12	393
13	429
14	541
17	452, 501
24	480
23, 6	359
9	343, 351
11	168
13	474
16	481
19	395
24, 2	474
6	539
7 <i>bis</i>	465
8	414, 474
9	539
11	528
15	545
17	349, 476
18	399
20	481
21	169, 515
22	185, 374, 420
23	349, 381, 431, 460, 515, 516
25	493, 554

Genesis

24, 27	445, 481
29	322, 438
31	379
32	544
36	420, 481
41	439, 454
43	349, 398
45, 47	349
49	550, 555
53	478
55	371
57	396
60	441
62	523
64	397
65	434, 476
67	473
25, 1	449
6	483
8	431
16	374, 488
21	171, 447, 480
22	492, 504
23	436
24	460
25	363, 535
27	505
29—34	235
30	429, 495
32 sq.	463
26, 1	480
4	479
7	473, 509
8	402, 484
9	417, 513, 516
10	508, 554
12	372
13	425, 496
14	447
16	436
20	496
21	439
24	449
26	353
27	379
29	385, 509, 510
31	385
32	494
27, 1	494
3	464
4	349, 459
7	349
9	439
10	181, 349
11	500
13	504
15	474
16	331, 425, 465
17	331
18	320, 376
19	449, 535
20	537

Genesis

27, 21	499, 500, 515
22	413
25	349
28	394
29	447
31	507
33	382, 433
34	506
36	490
38	516
40	390
41	171, 433
42	491
43	443
45	509
46	393, 493
28, 3	349, 350
9	346
11	425, 431
19	69, 467
20 sq.	524, 548
22	373
29, 2	524
3	479
4	379
6	378
8	549
9	545
14	496
16	438
17	434
18	402, 506
19	415, 475, 504, 543
21	351, 415, 425, 427
25	196, 514
26	491, 499
27	420
30	475, 488
31	494
33	449
34	449, 496
36	500
30, 1	447
2	437
14	349, 469
15	349 bis, 402, 439, 493
16	390
18	438, 497
20	413
25	432
28	170
29	361
30	382
31	511
32—39	238
35	227
37	469
38	298, 501
39	470, 501
40	396, 404, 470
42	471, 545

Genesis

31, 3	432
5	357
7	456, 469
8	470
9	351
10	469
10—12	238
18	535
19	530
21	436, 535
26	491, 537
27	235, 552
29	526, 527, 539, 553
31	537
32	532
33, 34	168
35	168, 258
36	534
38	509
42	482, 552
43	407, 496
49	400
50	397
32, 2	484
3	498
5 sqq.	382
8	428, 432
10	353
12	447, 539
13	393
14	170
15, 16	488
17	400, 489
20	490
24	354
26	435, 462
28	502, 516
30	517
31	431
32	381
33	408
33, 1	504, 554
4	434
8	517
9	343, 506, 518
12	402, 449
14	179, 390, 518
15	414, 491, 518
18	499
34, 1	460
3	444
7	467, 527
11	520
12	361
14	496
15	526
16	439
19	475
21	497, 498
22	272
23	353
25	374

Genesis

35, 2	462
4	146
8	468, 469
10	526
16	459, 463
17	349, 460
18	265
20	409
27	499
36, 1	344
14	498
38 <i>sqq.</i>	403
37, 2	477
3	467, 475
7	374, 535
8	450, 452
9	426
10	387
13	514
14	515
15	334
17	485
18	458
19	332
20	480, 500
21	509
22	480
23	438
24	426, 512
25	417
26	537
30	379, 500
34	437
35	454
36	431
38, 2	429
6	535
9	547
11	360, 417
13	357
14	469
15	434, 439
16	349, 548
18	481
23	500
25	357, 382
26	450, 475
27	494
29	357
39, 1	471
2	500
4	438, 503
7	503
9	173
10	381
14	462, 500
15	544
16	546
17	539
19	433
40, 1	471
2	464

Genesis

40, 5	359, 374
6	485
7	379, 502
8	433
10	501
12	498
13	395, 446, 500
14	169
15	420
20	464
41, 1	398, 494
2	473
3	404
4 <i>sqq.</i>	238
5	504, 507
5—7	488
9	504
13	505
15	504, 524
21	511, 543
38	361
39, 40	436
41, 43	396
44	507
53	451
42, 1	493
6	447, 471
11	499, 500
13	489
15, 16	518
19	181, 497
20	357
21	403
25	305, 374
28	329, 403, 443, 506
30	543
31	500
35	412, 554
37	351
38	494
43, 2	267, 450
6	322
7	322, 514
12	356, 417, 505
16	383
21	374, 458
22	305, 532
25	383
27	387, 513
28	387, 513, 532
29	329
30	434
31	434, 450
32	481
33	258
34	372, 432
44, 1	305
2	468
4	273, 403, 430, 518
5	447
6	273, 439
7	506

Genesis

44, 8	512, 521
14	387
16	359
17	398, 505, 520
18	350, 520
20	462
22	453, 548
26	508
32	518
33	409
45, 1	479
3	387, 499
6	387
8	471, 510
9—11	382
10	463
12 <i>bis</i>	344
13	469
18	375
22	374
23	394
24	511
26	437, 443, 504
27	443
28	387
46, 3	463
5	540
8	499
15	496
22	367
27	479
29	433
30	483, 518
33	498
47, 2	486
4	533
8	361
9	353, 395, 506, 512
12	374
17	465
18	506
19	409, 512
24, 26	373
29	459
30	353, 359
48, 1	365
3	353
5	356
6	494
8	517
10	269, 393
12	401
19	436
20	350
22	469
49, 1	524
3	273, 461
7	518
8	520
12	497
13	482
15	323, 486

Genesis

49, 16	487
17	440
25	310
28	374, 488
30	446
50, 4	382, 461
5	382
9	501
11	476
15	463
16	453
19	498
21	411
26	490

Exodus (Octat. Aeth.)

1, 7	409
12	555
22	181
2, 3	269
9	348
12	383
18	382, 449
20	347
3, 2	426
4, 6 <i>sqq.</i>	259
16	395
19	115, 376
28	479
5, —	257
7, 10	415
20	265
6, 7	415
7, 5	415
25	371, 488
8, 10	374
9, 35	471
10, 1	471
7	273
8	334
24	354
25	380, 511
11, 7	526
12, 11	523
29	251
35	196
13, 2	376
13	278
14, 5	428
20	363
27	394
15, 1	356
20	258
27	404
16, 3	363, 521
22	501, 504
23	171, 504
24, 26	504
28	507
29	504
17, 1	530
5	533

Exodus

17, 14	272
18, 16	268
26	357
19, 1	544
4	361
20, 1	328
8	480
9	371
11	403
17	184
21, 6	384
23	483
29	525
36	404
37	372 <i>bis</i> , 525
22, 6	525
8	243, 453
19	436
28	180
23, 7	535
22, 25	357
24, 4	404
17	354
25, 11	394, 434
20	403
28	434
26, 3	200, 403
4	407
9	409
20	252
30	528
33	254
35	252
37	407
27, 20, 21	96
28, —	277
3	447
4	532
7	403
20	473
29, 12	404
17	208
36	403
30, 4	296, 350, 533
13	69
36	533
31, 18	323
32, 5	260
10	183, 396
12	207
32	550
33, 3	383
12	181
34, 1	181
4	331
6	402
10	532
13	358
15	539
24	335
35	532
35, 5	528

Exodus

35, 10	314
22	258, 323
28	534
36, 3	374
5	528
6	440
11	410
12	356
31	235
37, 1	367
38, 13	96
25	534
26	354
39, 17	533
40, 7	534
15	544
32	377

Leviticus (Octat. Aeth.)

1, 4	529
8	331
14	555
3, 1	555
4, 12	244
5, 16	373
6, 13	373
7, 15	528
36	359
38	528
10, 7	500
19	539
11, 7	305
32	532
34	533
35	532
36	315
40	308
13, 14	528
24	199
37	462
46	545
14, 2, 19	528
34	545
35	538
40	533
50—52	462
15, 13	371
16, 16	312
17	535
17, 13	257
18, 6	536
19, 9	530
20, 5	409
6	96
21, 12	500
14	280
22, 24	250
23, 6	371, 489
22	200
24, 16	180
25, 22	412
36, 38	355

Leviticus

25, 46	189
50	534
26, 10	461
12	355
22	312
46	409

Numbers (*Octat. Aeth.*)

1, 1	534
53	383
3, 3	532
4, 9	298
25	316
28, 29	279
5, 4	555
6	267
17	462
18, 25	331
6, 4	412
13	528
7, 1	269
72	371
8, 2	368
8	323
10, 6	373
34	180
11, 20	316
29	521
12, 11	350
13, 28	407
14, 2	551
5	180
8	351
21	519
22	490
28	519
34	407
41	517
16, 3	493, 519
15	267
21, 26	194
30	211
17, 2	377, 409
10	194
11, 12	449
17	303
18, 3	355
6	441
8	351
15	530
31	464
19, 10, 16	323
17	277
21	323
20, 5	537
8, 9	425
14—20	382
17	476
18	422
19	409, 422 <i>bis</i>
21, 9	545
21 <i>sqq.</i>	382

Numbers

21, 22	476
25	338
29	146
32	196
35	92
22, 3	193
5 <i>sqq.</i>	382
20	550
21	278
22	523
28	373, 490
29	449, 552
32	490
33	449
23, 6	538
8, 24	529
24, 10	490
23	114
25, 11	222
26, —	252
63	271, 359
27, 17	535
29, 12	489
31, 23	530
26	474
49	356
53	345
32, 1	438
14	399
17	383, 407
34, 3	404
35, 7	367
14	486
23	356

Deuteronomy (*Octat. Aeth.*)

1, 18	530
2, 3	269, 455, 519
5	92
16	544
19	92
23	412
25	545
27	92
29	412
3, 5	286
11	367
26	492, 519
4, 9	186
11	426
12	525
19	417, 539
36	186
42	183, 356
5, 22	263, 472
6, 1	186, 530
9	286
11	470, 474
20	530
23	351
7, 9	243

Deuteronomy

8, 3	390
5	555
12—14	417
15	462, 476
9, 1	476
2	478
6	351
14	396
15	426
21	386
10, 1	181
4	534
6	441
11, 3	530
11	440
14	268
26, 27, 28	422
30	404
12, 2	232, 305, 531
18, 22	350
29	531
13, 1	539
6	532
11	349
16	426
14, 5	237, 284, 287
18	261
21	308
23	350
28	425
15, 2, 3	440
10	269
15	500
18	455, 482
20	350
17, 3	356
16	269
19, 3	372
20, 1	242
4	383
21, 1	356
13	357
17	373
22, 1	81, 189
19	455
24	180
29	457
24, 4	457
10	429
25, 3	357
11	312
28, 7	312
10 <i>bis</i>	495
22	240
25	312
27	534
30	351
34	248
40, 42	315
56	280
61	530
30, 11	281

Deuteronomy

31, 20	211
27	270
29	211
32, 1	524
2	396
15	109
28	233
38	357
40	520
51	404
33, 11	530
17	368
34, 12	530

Joshua (Octat. Aeth.)

3, 5	260
15	358
16	450
4, 8, 10	449
11	331, 449
18	359
5, 6	433, 538
10	252
12	463
13	485, 497, 504, 513, 515
6, 1	536
3	189
5	185
8	263
9	383, 483
10	173, 511, 535
13	366, 412
14	412
15	464
16	373
18	459
20	433
21	395, 396
24	143
7, 7	521
12	450
13	449
21	409, 442, 487
22	409, 442
8, 2	458
4	386
14	402, 404
17	511, 512
18	190
20	383, 485
22	377
23	360, 482
24	380, 450
25	143
33	243
35	404
37	471
9, 2	268, 451
3	412
5	539
7	473

Joshua

9, 9	449
22	351
23	457, 492
10, 1	344
4	344, 409, 422
5	554
9	263
10	433
11	358
19	189
20	433, 450
32	489
11, 2	286
4	412, 497, 554
8	286
14	345, 497
15	272
16	254
20	434
12, 6	342
9	404
13, 5	245, 265
15, 57	367
16, 3	254, 384, 397
5	385
7	315
10	341
17, 12	453
13	431, 435
15	436
16	345
18	344
18, 3	379
6	432
13	254, 384
19, 9	343, 394
28	286
47	188, 189
20, 2	398
6	169, 432, 532
21, 1	466
4 bis, 6	488
7	369, 488
16	367
18, 19, 22, 24	488
26	488, 535
29, 32, 33	488
38	369, 488
39	367, 410
40	331, 410
42	479
43	273, 287, 479
22, 2	344
4	432
5	479
12	458
13	321
16	334, 454, 479
18	454
19	380
20	363, 514
22	550

Joshua

22, 23	344
24	510
25	437
26	509
27	453, 464
28	494, 509
29	387, 454, 520 bis
23, 1	501
2	413, 501
3	344
5	416
6	530
8	505
9	477, 505
10	488
11	345
12	452
13	416
14	272, 287, 479
16	462
24, 2	462, 479
4	321
12	509
14	462
15	334, 456, 555
16	462, 520
17	478, 536
19	312
20	420, 462
22	208, 345, 458
23	462
24	504
26	477
29	188
30	272
31	407
32	429, 488
33	410, 487

Judges (Octat. Aeth.)

1, 1	481
4	487
5	437
8	426
10	449, 467
11	467
14	492, 517
24	245
25	402
27	513
36	254
2, 1	542
1—3	382
3	446, 542
8	463
14	432
19	475
22	515
3, 6	452
8	366
10	431
14	366, 487

Judges

8, 16	536
17	503
24	431, 451
25	484
27	504
4, 4	279
15	467
16	509
19	476
20	493, 513, 516
5, 1	502
6	313
12	198
28	195
6, 10	528
13	381
14	168
15	381, 474
17	537
20	426, 461
22	381, 431
23	519
24	387
25	469
27	458
28	243, 476
30	494
39	373
7, 4	529
5	543
10	539
12	432
16	446
17	393
19	490
20	190
24	436
8, 4	487
10	432
11	523
19	353, 520, 552
24	374
25	453
26	258, 304, 488
30	500
32	282
9, 7—20	382
8	447
9	173, 447
16—20	550
22	447
29	521
30	432
44	431
48	382
49	432
10, 10	447
14	208
11, 12 <i>sqq.</i>	382
17 <i>sqq.</i>	402
23	405
25	433

Judges

11, 35, 36	357
37	486
39	442
40	374
12, 5	499
14	494
13, 2	523
4	512
7	509, 527, 546
9	443
11	516
12	500
14	508
17	516
18	537
21	512
22	506
23	508, 553
24	503
14, 2	522, 527
3	514, 541
5	504, 522
6	512, 543
8	429, 504
13	524
15, 17	405
18	545, 552
15, 1	429, 454
2	436 <i>bis</i> , 489, 527
5	469
8	301
11	554
13	452, 526
14	376, 543
18	477
19	527
16, 2	492
3	152
6	548
7	512, 548
9	436, 543
10	196
11	548
13	524
14	188
15	490
16	459
17	208
18	373, 375
19	188, 434
25	523
26	532
27	483, 537
28	415, 447
29	470
17, 2	426
3	481
5	426
6	374, 529
9	530
13	450
18, 2	462

Judges

18, 8	379
9	436, 458, 485
11	482
13	395
19	357, 465, 543
23	434
30	546
31	545
19, 1	172
5	217, 275
6	443
8	523
9	522
10	395
11	387, 476
12	462
14	450
16	426
17	254, 288, 480
18	498
23	520
27	476
30	511
20, 3	379
7	189
9	527
10	375, 403
15	404
16	542
17	404
18	482
22	449
28	515
31	387
32	313
34	356
39	460, 486
40	504
41	356
43	452
45	486
21, 1	518
5	539
7	402
16	403
Ruth (<i>Octat. Aeth.</i>)	
1, 1	522, 528
4	387, 489, 504
8	529
9	456
12	543
13	443, 511
15	489
16	349
17	518
18	458
19	281
21	482
2, 2	534
3	529
4	349, 519

Ruth		4 Kings		Psalms	
2, 5	516	10, 31	539	15, 6	180
8	348	13, 17	235	16, 3	400
10	284	19, 29	422	4	398
11	506			5	357
12	532	2 Esrae (= Ezra and		9	390
13	520	Nehemiah)		17, 20	435
14	519	2, 30 <i>var.</i>	188	26	441
17	426, 488	8, 22	265	29	185
20	400	9, 11	354	40	401
3, 3	353, 359			41	90
4	507, 531	Esther		18, 12	268
8	492	9, 22	100	14	406
10	489			16	356
13	329, 518, 520	Job		20, 8	359
15	367	2, 9	451	21, 9	545
16	538	5, 19	373	18	267
17	330, 482	6, 17	266	20	269
4, 1	425	8, 4	549	22, 4	548
4	492, 506	9, 4	451	24, 6	355
6	433	13, 24	357	14	272
11	519	16, 14	399, 473	26, 7	287
14	540	31, 3	407	16	357
1 Kings or 1 Samuel		9	549	19	486
<i>(Libri Regum ed.</i>		35, 2	268	27, 5	358
DILLMANN, 1861)		5	384	29, 4	358
3, 3	270	39, 25	381	30, 16	401, 410
21	484	12	486	21	407
7, 13	269			31, 1	533
16, 13	393	Psalms (ed. LUDOLF)		2	532
21, 4	549	1, 2	386	14	359
22, 13	356	3	394	33, 14	272
25, 5	488	5	386	15	194
26, 7, 11	234	2, 1	363, 379	16	359
25	180	5	544	34, 9	180
30, 25	393	8	358, 395	24	381
		10	363	36, 26	530
2 Kings or 2 Samuel		3, — Heading	418	28	194
<i>(Lib. Reg.)</i>		1	335, 397	37, 6	360
2, 5	422	4, 4	537	7	433
3, 1	374	5	518	8	393
13, 4	374	7	398	12	436
15, 4	521	5, 10	357, 511	15	500
22, 6	358	6, 5	396	21	323, 357, 403
		10	401	38, 7	335
3 Kings or 1 Kings (Lib.		7, 3	549	8	363
Reg.)		4	360, 439, 549	17	545
1, 14	355	14	534	39, 10	376
3, 36	379	15	376	17	306
7, —	367	8, 1	320	21	381, 440
10, 12	379	4	344	41, 4	272
17, 18	335	7	401	42, 3	181
19, 4	519	8	333	4	358
		9, 13	538	43, 5	414
4 Kings or 2 Kings (Lib.		26	400	22	378, 553
Reg.)		29	357	23	273
1, 14	487	42	357, 399	44, 2	384
5, 25	379	11, 7	372	18	353
26	422	12, 1—3	379	45, 2	418, 550
7, 18	409	3	397	5	383
		6	422, 443	47, 9	358
				48, 2	554
				7	357

Psalms

48, 11	358
13	344
49, 2	376
8	524
13	550
17, 18	526
19	550
21	359
50, 4	344
5	363, 481
17	552
19	390
51, 6	376
52, 7	293
54, 17	409
27	302
61, 9	381
11	272, 344, 358
63, 4	431
64, 11	267
14	433
65, 15	361
67, 1	359
18	372
19	268
24	359
68, 2	438
17	356
18	181
19	357
69, 4	381
70, 18	395
20, 21	355
71, 1	355
6	199
72, 2	554
3	359
5	302
28	358
74, 10	501
77, 1	501
9	211
12	405
35	474
37	359, 501
69	500
78, 13	372
79, 3	375
14	305
15	381
80, 8	524
12 sq.	553
83, 1	319
3	580
4	319
87, 4	103, 400
12	355
16	267
88, 2, 6	355
89, 2	344
6	266
9	501

Psalms

89, 10	359
11	329
17	534
90, 2	356
91, 2	355
92, 3	344
6	478
93, 9	514
94, 1	375
96, 13	358
100, 7	463
102, 1, 2	519
21	359
103, 34	420
105, 11	359
22	272, 273
106, 4	534
108, 13	200
14	541
112, 3	376
113, 13 sqq.	438
17, 18	501
117, 8, 9	543
17	525
19	328
24	381
118, 9	379
26	186
34	350
64	186
84	320
87	554
119, 5	520
120, 5	173, 519
7	200, 519
121, 7	358
122, 3	546
123, 2, 3	387
126, 3	269
130, 3	525
4	183
135, 1	497
138, 7	555
17	547
18 bis	302
140, 7	404
143, 14	542
144, 5	466
146, 5	358
11	301
147, 6	437
149, 6	365

Proverbs

3, 3	349
8, 5	270
15, 18	331
30, 7	439

Ecclesiastes

7, 24	461
-------	-----

Ecclesiastes

8, 16	522
17	521

Canticles

1, 9, 15	394
2, 2	394
9	402
18	191
3, 5	419, 545
8	229
4, 7	335
9	373
10	521
11 bis	353
5, 8	347
9	349
10	302
15	301
7, 2	296
3	218
9	90
8, 6	323

Isaiah

6, 1 (in <i>Gad. Yārēd</i>	
5, 29 sq.)	485
13	372
7, 22	480
8, 1, 3	198
14, 10	381
18, 2	226
40, 2	182
49, 15	548
51, 12	334
53, 6	339
12	400
57, 13 bis	147
58, 11	281

Jeremiah

2, 14	223
11, 19	447
35, 14 (<i>Fref.</i>)	456
37, 1 (<i>Fref.</i>)	540

Ezekiel

3, 2	351
13, 19	476

Daniel

7, 10	368
12, 1	395

Amos

6, 6	512
15	210, 409
8, 6	235
9	247
10	350
12	409
9, 1	208

Amos	
9, 7	348
14	210

Habakkuk	
3, 2, 7	208

Zephaniah	
3, 8	380

Zechariah	
3, 1	321

Zechariah	
14, 13	147

Malachi	
1, 2	403
11	376

(b) APOCRYPHA.

Tobit	
1, 13	356
3, 15	528
5, 15	345, 384
6, 2, 3, 4 <i>bis</i>	425
5	426
6	425
12	426
13 <i>bis</i>	425
16	189, 425
7, 9	426
8, 2, 3	425
16	346
10, 5	551
12	168, 490
11, 3 <i>bis</i> , 5, 7	425
8, 10	434
16	520
12, 1, 2, 5	425
8	269
10	413
13, 4	354

Judith	
8, 29	444
10, 3 <i>sq.</i>	440
16	444

Liber Sapientiae	
2, 13	407
4, 12	427
20	482
5, 11	270
6, 5, 8, 16	384
7, 17	540
8, 8	269
9, 11	384
12	529
17	427
11, 4	495
12, 16	265, 472
20	409
13, 11	268
18	218
14, 1	471
7	495, 533
15	471
16	267
15, 10	497
16, 28	455
17, 10	454
18, 4	454
10	466
13	484
15	431
19, 2	454

Liber Siracidae	
3, 18	555
4, 4	357
6, 12	350
11, 19	457
12, 1	532
16	349
13, 4	533
15, 20	533
17, 6	533
28	512
18, 5	463
21, 21	276
22, 1	279
23, 14	528
23	375
27, 20	40
30, 8	441
16	266, 269
19	508
34, 4	554
20	224
36, 4	520
5	247
31	323
38, 21	355
40, 6	512
41, 21	518
42, 6	269
43, 33	472
50, 18	275

Baruch	
4, 10	269

(c) NEW TESTAMENT

(ed. PLATT, 1830; *cf.* Reprint of PLATT's Edition by PRAETORIUS, 1899).

Matthew	
1, —	321
2	321
16	356
22	395
17	414
20	454
18	484
25	535
2, 1	327, 428, 451
2	342

Matthew	
2, 3	193, 451
4	379, 479
5	468
7	532
8	321, 451
9	395, 419, 531
10	433
12	402, 428, 431
13	171, 419, 428, 544, 546

Matthew	
2, 14	359
15	395, 419
16	395, 397, 468, 479
17	405, 495
18, 22	454
23	538
3, 4	505
6	395
8	414
9	322, 407, 437, 453

Matthew

3, 10	449
11	359, 414, 457
15	414, 457
4, 1	395
3	413
4	381, 390, 413, 510, 512
5	465
6	384, 389
10	341, 363, 481, 527
13	399, 465
17	456
22	472
23	172
24	375, 470, 501
25	425
5, 1	425
2	357
6	391
9	463
11	498
13	414, 471, 525
14	453, 499
18	419, 546
19	329, 441, 474
20	475
21	391
22	357, 470
23	420, 545
24	357, 400
26	419
28	390, 428, 449
29	328, 443, 457, 544
30	363, 443, 457, 544
32	486, 550
33	385, 414
34	386, 435
35	435
36	282, 306, 453
37	380, 381, 414, 418, 511, 555
42	395
43	357
45	471
46	411, 514, 517
47	381, 514
48	341
6, 1	414, 418, 550
2	293, 395
5	411, 442, 453
8	545
9	413
10	412, 555
11	392
13	343
14, 15	412
17	434
23	379
24	418, 555
25	170, 514
26	514
27	399

Matthew

30	260, 341, 379, 526
31	414
33	342
34	345, 412
7, 2	433
3	379, 522
7	345
9	514
11	379, 453, 472
12	412
13	280
16	514
18	453
19	505
20	393
21	320, 510, 535
23	405
24	435
25, 26	398
27	501
29	359
8, 2	470
3	472
4	345, 414
5	322, 326
7	376
8	457
9	328, 375
10	361, 530
11	414
12	169, 472
13	484
14	451
15	434
16	451, 470
19	350, 380, 429
20	380
24	172, 393, 416
27	415
28	335, 402, 416
29	377
30 <i>sqq.</i>	247
34	456, 501
9, 3	403, 429, 471
5	455, 515
12	414, 525
15	379, 420, 453, 545
17	478
18	375
20	393, 402, 443
21	420, 545
22	393
23	242
24	510
28	378, 453
29	346, 434
32	470
33	481
35	545
37	413
10, 1	398
4	336

Matthew

10, 5	330
6	414
8	385, 470
11	333, 334, 517, 530
13	397
14	333
15	475
16	376, 401
19	518
20	398, 500, 529
21	397
22	395
25	379
26	414
28	414, 453, 472
29	416, 541
32	400
33	547
38	401
40	341
42	363
11, 1	377
3	378, 514 <i>bis</i> , 515
4	171, 298
6	389
7	402
8	382
9	382, 475
10	400, 402
14	170
15	458
19	376
20	182, 396
21	418, 449, 520, 522
22	405
23	170, 418, 549
25	320, 393
26	400
27	395, 404, 440
28	375
12, 1	402
2	454
3	412, 554
4	456
8	391
9	450
10	455
11	397
12	455
13	143, 405, 489
18	397
20	546
22	546, 554
25	403, 418
26	403
27	345
28	415
29	269, 335, 419, 449, 513, 550
31	391
32	397
33	393, 555

Matthew

12, 34	379, 392
37	393
40	371, 555
41	329
43	402
44	380
45 . 254, 488, 496, 535	
46	456
47	394, 456
48	334
13, 1	399
2	416
3	534
5	398
6	527
9	458
10	402
12	411
13	419, 545
14	452
17	456
21	397
22	404
24	435
25	237
27	514
29	380, 511
30 . 383, 439, 456, 458	
31	435
34	404
36	468
37—39	412
40	555
41	392
42	377
43	405, 458
44	393
47	396
48	451
49	393
50	380
53	330
54	328, 416
55	505
57	380
58	269, 508
14, 1	466
2	390, 480, 495
4	457
5	456
6	401
7	457
8	395, 450
13	402
15	345, 468
16	457, 510
17	377, 404
18	377
19	395, 398
21	396, 404
22	174, 459
23	402

Matthew

14, 24	393, 400, 401
26	393, 409, 461
27	406, 499
28 . 375, 402, 409, 550	
29	399
36	457
15, 4	322
7	430
8	328, 384
11	396, 397
12	514
14	312, 396, 507
16	499
18	272
19	397, 473
20 . 329, 473, 490, 545	
21	396
22	376
23	401
24	328
26	442, 455
28	320
31	416
32	329, 371
33, 34	361
36	487
38	404, 409
39	396
16, 1	456, 483
2	199, 492 <i>bis</i>
3	199, 453, 492
4	476
5	454
7, 8	403
9	361, 387
11	510, 518
12	456
13 . . 486, 516, 540	
14	516
15	484
18	435
20	457, 535
21	171, 295
22 . 387, 397, 520 <i>bis</i>	
23 . 401, 414, 461, 470	
26 . 522, 537, 548, 554	
28	429, 546
17, 1	363
3	400, 545
4	377, 490
8	335, 512
9	328
10	170, 383
11	449, 526
12 . . 171, 414, 449	
13	402
14	545
15	494
16	454
17	379, 508
18	398
19	379, 453

Matthew

17, 20 . 361, 377, 432, 436	
21	361
22	170
23	405
25 . . 450, 515, 516	
26	415
27 . 191, 249, 391, 482	
18, 1 . . 415, 425, 545	
3	548
7	390, 407
8 . 360, 457, 482, 544	
9 . 360, 398, 457, 480	
11	173, 458
12	368, 488
13 . . . 368, 475 <i>bis</i>	
14	457
15	363
16	373
19	394
20	409, 500
21	361, 397
22	373
23	481
24	488
28	487
30	435
31	538
32	320
33	411
34	392, 548
19, 1	404
3	390, 514
6	415
7	173, 456
8 . . 494, 504, 510	
9 . . 419, 429, 550	
10	455, 509
11	419, 510
12	493, 518
14	361, 454
15	397
16	517, 550
17	272
18 . . 336, 463, 508	
19	463
20	442, 517
21 . . 375, 429, 456	
22	437
23 . . 429, 472, 497	
24 . 265, 455, 473, 543	
25	415
26	328
27	415
29	357, 372
20, 2	374
3	441, 484, 490
5	344, 490
6 . . 379, 482, 490	
8 . . 385, 420, 438	
9	374
10	374, 537
11	426

Matthew

20, 12	530
15	499
16	498
18	395
19	397
23	454
24	425
25	397
26	443
27 <i>sq.</i>	543
28	481
30	404, 425
34	434
21, 1	429
2	278, 406, 444
3	406
4	329, 495, 536
5	480, 482
7, 8	397
9	519
10	498
13	413, 444
15	437
16	514, 538
18	431
19	404
21	381, 470
23	438, 483, 516
24	336, 439, 545
25	379, 515
27	507
28	438
29 <i>bis</i>	381
30	381, 467
31	394, 436
32	385, 401, 512, 526
33	480
34	459
35	429
36, 37	437
38	375
40	439
41	385
42	446
43	393
22, 3	458
5	429
7	458
9	396, 414
10	433
12	541
13	444
16	429
17	443
18	444
20	425
21	470
24	173, 519
25	488, 527
26	489
28	471, 516
29	472, 508

Matthew

22, 36	336, 474
37	481
39	489
40	488
42	516
44	401
45	443
46	454
23, 2, 4	398
5	391
6	315, 396
8	363
10	441
11	436
12	169
13 <i>sq.</i>	520
14	454
16	435
18	435 <i>bis</i> , 518
22	435
23	373, 457, 474
25 <i>sq.</i>	386
26	385
27	472
30	552
34	396
36	436
38	441
39	519
24, 2	489
7	398
11	466
13	450, 529
14	397
17	458, 555
19	406, 407
21	393
22	143, 470, 553
23	376, 377, 444, 509
24	436, 458, 466, 551
25	449
26	376, 431
30	485
32	425
34	329
38	171, 400
40	365, 489
42	336
43	456, 553
45	243
48	454
50	528
25, 1	487
2	471
4	354
5	268
6	432
7, 8	331
9	522
11	331, 383, 442
15	374, 429, 533
16	407, 488

Matthew

25, 21	396
24	485, 530
26	320, 485
27	521, 554
29	442
32	400, 470
36	435
37, 38	484
39	435
44	440, 484 <i>bis</i>
26, 2	395
5	509
9	554
12	391
13	329, 380, 436
15	361, 487, 524
16	171, 405
18	430
20	451
21	172
22	375
24	398, 552
26	376
28	468
29	482
31	437
32	431
33	437
34	183, 372, 545
35	526, 548 <i>bis</i>
36 <i>bis</i>	377
39	549
40	432, 453, 484
41	445, 509
42	455
44	344
46	168
47	400, 471, 487
49	520
51	444
53	524, 537
55	171, 400
59	174, 540
61	454
63	515
65	391
66	519
72	538
75	430
27, 4	335, 397
7	268, 446
11	400
12	335
13	361
14	541
15	171, 453, 472
17	515
18	392
19	431
20	381
21	334
22	439

Matthew

27, 23	450, 517
24	434, 445, 474
27	295
29	520
30	434, 447
31	438
32, 34	458
36	451
37	398
40, 42, 43	549
45	490
46	371
47	328, 497
49	173, 456, 515
51	468
52, 53	315
55	440
56	328
57	440, 451
62	489
64	456
65	444
28, 1	391
3	469, 470
4	393
6	375
8	389
9	436, 520
14	439
18	435
20	456

Mark

1, 4	172, 444
5	440
6	470, 496
7	435, 457
10	485, 538
11	437
15	541
16	191, 399, 428
20	357
24	461
27	477, 537
32	464
33	501
37	415
38	403
44	420
45	377, 463, 539
2, 1	485
7	472
9	515
10	457
15	478
18	379, 471
19	410, 420, 513, 545
21	418, 550
22	428
25	512, 514
3, 2	513
3	383

Mark

3, 4	472
10	479
11	463
17	497
20	478
21	539
23	507
24	476
29	399
32	376, 554
34	376, 401, 410
35	554
4, 1	478
8	477
10	343, 363, 439
12	452
13	477
17	386
19	477
20	372
24	477
31	475, 479
32	316, 479
36	478
37	447, 480
38	491
41	433, 477
5, 2	450
9	498, 516
14	500
15	443
23	456
35	191
36	386
37	511
40	437
41	497
6, 35	449
45	436
7, 3	386, 434
6	384
15 <i>bis</i>	414
19	381
21	436
27	373
8, 1	528
2	489, 491
38	437
9, 41	470
45	345
10, 6	273
21	375
22	360, 482
30	440
37	364
11, 4	290, 298
5	377
8	305
21	331
12, 6	401
22	366
41	404

Mark

13, 3	404
7	304
21	444
14, 7	405, 420
11	435
25	331
41	373
51	360
15, 6	392
21, 29	288
16, 16	169, 528, 529
19	396

Luke

1, 4	440
11	399
23	394, 475
36	358
59	371
2, 4	339
21	371
24	418
46	489
4, 12	494
38	431
5, 10	191
33	343
6, 42	357
49	398
7, 19	515
8, 8	372
13	405
35	443
49	191
9, 3	513
11	529
12	531
29	545
38	520
39	268, 351, 439
41	319
56	545
10, 5	531
35	265
11, 7	167
17	362
20	417
22	435
26	436
27	545
36	363
42	428
12, 20	319
35	501
36	268
49	449
13, 1	405
8	383
14	371
16	487
14, 8	417
26	343

Luke

14, 32	550
15, 4, 7	368
8	268
18, 21	320
17, 21, 23	376, 377
18, 16	361
24	484
30	372
19, 5	163
8	372
17	243, 319
20	376
26	439
20, 5sq.	555
11	449
21, 3	450
22, 32	267, 359
37	400
53	526, 545
23, 20, 22	373
38	385, 388
24, 32	171

John

1, 1, 2	394
11	343
13	470
19	382
21	511
22	382
32	542
33	532
2, 4	320
9	441
10	474
15	554
19	371
3, 29, 30	413
4, 2	414
5	532
16	375
21	320, 380
29	387
54	466
6, 9	499
12	535
17	167
38	525
42	357
65	395
68	394
7, 23	212, 414
30	180
32	356
45	382
46	386
8, 7	181
19	357
49	437
53	345
9, 1, 13	360
31	525

John

10, 1, 2	402
16	471
11, 6	371
19	191
31	191, 537
50	403, 543
52	376
12, 26	380
43	543
13, 22	403
36	269
14, 28	436
16, 14	343
17, 4	267
18, 23	549
19, 5	376
18	394
20 bis	388
26	376
27	339, 376
31	301
33	450
20, 13, 15	320
25	427
26	371
21, 3	191
8	488
15, 16	184
21	472
22	335

Acts of the Apostles

1, 20	339
2, 13	433
4, 3	244
5, 8	361
25	376
7, 49 bis	336
9, 1	387
10	376
10, 14	387, 520
11, 18	387
12, 23	266
16, 15	550
17, 16	191
18, 7	523
19, 33	180
21, 40	388
22, 19	344
27	381
23, 5	398
9	387
26, 3	450
14	388
27, 27 bis	371

Romans

1, 12	449
14	554
3, 9	449
26	381
4, 3	382

Romans

4, 5	345
5, 7	387
6, 5	549
8, 7	512
38	534
10, 12	314
11, 28	399
15, 14	437, 473, 486, 541
24	377, 399

I Corinthians

3, 22	418, 555
23	469, 496
4, 3	344
5, 3	548
4	268
6, 3	387
7, 35	191
9, 14	270, 285
15	455, 490, 543
11, 5	281
28	267
31	344
13, 3—7	158
4 sqq.	160
14, 21	526

2 Corinthians

5, 3	295
19	267, 268
10, 1	520
11, 3	387
24	372, 404
28	272
12, 2, 3	387

Galatians

1, 19	525
3, 8, 18	270
21	552
4, 1	420, 545 bis
11	387
5, 10	453

Ephesians

3, 7	422, 441
4, 8	268
26	518
5, 8	385
21	190
6, 2	357
15	267

Philippians

2, 12	386
-------	-----

Colossians

1, 23	422
25	422, 532
3, 1	549
11	254

Titus		James		I John	
3, 10 <i>bis</i>	373	3, 3	381	3, 16	390
Hebrews		4	361	4, 18	285
2, 3	266	5	476	2 John 10 sq.	520
17	399	6	199	Jude 9	182
3, 16	334	8	472	Revelation	
5, 12	181	17	200	2, 1	427
6, 7	541	4, 4	356	4	183
9	486	7 <i>bis</i>	381	3, 18	434
7, 8	377	11	356	19	184
9, 3	273	5, 6	381	4, 8	363
4	384	I Peter		5, 3	269
27	455	1, 11	336, 379	6, 1	375
10, 7	376	3, 20	367	8	373
31	455	4, 5	441, 500	9, 16	372
11, 1	267	2 Peter		10, 9	357
7	356	1, 6	508	11, 1	361
35	267	21	267	14, 2	199, 258
12, 8	276	2, 5	486	17, 11	490
25	526	3, 11	267	18, 6	372
27	537	I John		14	304
James		2, 18	461	19, 13	473
1, 14	342	19	414, 526	22, 2	394
17	217	3, 1	379	9	417
24	267				

B. ETHIOPIC COLLECTIONS AND WORKS

—APOCRYPHAL, ECCLESIASTICAL, LEGENDARY, HISTORICAL
AND ETHICAL—MOST FREQUENTLY CITED IN THE GRAMMAR.

Chrest. (= Chrestomathia Aethiopica, ed. DILL- MANN, 1866)		Chrest.		Chrest.	
Pref. XV	465	29, 27	539	45, 24	495
XVI	465, 482	31, 1	429	26	271
3, 22 <i>sq.</i>	449	2	426	47, 9	531
4, 21	413	17 <i>sq.</i>	523	49, <i>ult.</i>	470
5, 13 <i>sq.</i>	539	36, 9	465	52, 5	323
6, 13 <i>sqq.</i>	553	37, 26	534	72, 1	267
11, 23 <i>sq.</i>	462	38, 2	463	73, 7	268
13, 14	462	40, 17, 19	427	74, 21	348
14, 10, 18	427	41, 13	458	75, 2—7, 21—25	555
16, last 5 lines	507	42, 6	456	76, 1	271, 509
17, 10	388	8	506	14	384
18, 7, 15	427	9 <i>sq.</i>	484, 522	15—21	555
19, 1	538	14	427	78, 25 <i>sqq.</i>	495
24 and 26	544	15	439	86, 13 <i>sqq.</i>	551
24, 4	345	20	360	91, 16	486
5	357	26	391	92, 13	413
20, 21, 25	429	43, 8	345	22, 26	438
25, 14	429	22	495	93, 2	438
26, 8	425	44, 1	391, 439	24	458
9	434	11	349	96, 11	439
11, 29	425	16	432	16	431
29, 13	442	24, 26, 28 <i>bis</i>	270	97, 11	334
25	342	45, 5	475	21 <i>sq.</i>	431
		20	270	98, 24	206
		21 <i>sq.</i>	522	104, 25 <i>sq.</i>	334

Chrest.

105, 3, 5	334
110 (12, 2)	431
112 (18, 1)	431
120 (53, 1)	358
121 (59)	305
122 (60)	315
123 (66, 4)	358
126 (79)	355
147, Str. 3, l. 2	210
Str. 3, l. 3	465

I Esr. (= Esrae liber apocryphus Graecus)

2, 11	269
48	528
49	478

4 Esr. (= Esrae Apocalypsis, ed. LAURENCE)

Gen. Ref.	88
1, 28	541
2, 6	454, 541
22 <i>var.</i>	495
3, 26	375
54, 55	551
60	366
6, 25	210
51	537
62	406
65 (LAUR. 75)	495
7, 16 (LAUR. 24)	495
20	551
8, 12	355
67	545
9, 24 (LAUR. 27)	495
32	355
39	434, 493
10, 15 (20)	355
39 (54)	355
51 (65)	495
11, 25	331
13, 20	454
46	245
55 (58)	355

G. Ad. (= Gadla Adām, ed. TRUMPP, 1880)

General References . 50,	
137, 150, 164, 229, 231,	
235, 238, 247, 250, 253,	
257, 259, 393, 492	
4, 12	297
5, 1	297
3 <i>sq.</i>	345
6, 17	427
18	541
7, 4	345
5, 6 <i>bis</i> , 7, 8, 9, 14 .	379

G. Ad.

8, 8 <i>sq.</i>	458
11, 19	270, 354
15, 16	255
17, 8	267
21, 21	208
22, 11	269
23, 8	270
9	206
24, 8	270
25, 10	206
27, 11	416
29, 10	350
26	360
30, 23	431
38, 15 <i>sq.</i>	477
39, 23	465
40, 7	342
42, 11	501
43, 24	349
45, 6	361
48, 7	551
49, 9	409
50, 17	359
53, 16	271
54, 25	418
55, 2	418
57, 2	351
9	522
62, 8	540
78, 24	522
79, 24	108
89, 3	458
15	427
90, 13	168
18	168, 552
21	172
93, 19	452
95, 28	172
97, 12 <i>sq.</i>	553
19	553
103, 9	172
108, 12	271
109, 10	351
23	398
110, 7	411
116, 11	270
123, 12	271
124, 7	296
127, 16	270
129, 26	228
135, 19	206, 271
136, 28	271
137, 21, 22	271
138, 2—6	499
146, 10	427
147, 18 <i>sq.</i>	171
20	168
148, 1	413
164, 1 <i>sqq.</i>	172
4, 20	294
166, 29	294

Hen. (= Liber Henoch, ed. DILLMANN, 1851; cf. Das Buch Henoch, ed. FLEMMING, 1902)

1, 2	478, 509
4	390
5	479
6	478
7	479
8	469, 505
9	390, 437
2, 1	503, 535
2	467
3, —	411
4, —	269, 400
5, 1	391, 535, 538
4	281, 443, 478
6	390
8	438, 452
6, 1	420, 500
3	356, 417, 539
4	433, 439
7, 1	374 <i>bis</i> , 479
2	488
8, 1	296, 315, 475
2	263, 477
3	252
9, 2	433
4	519
5	400, 463, 494
6	538
8	331, 406
10	400, 502
11	545
10, 1	521
2	170, 345
5	292
6	468
8	447
9	398, 466, 473
11	342
12	461, 544, 546
14	461
16	446, 465
17	546
18	433
19	505
20	33
21	509
22	447, 457
11, 2	502
12, 1	334, 389
2	497
3	172
4	433
6	399, 513
13, 1	492
2	420
3	502
7	546
8	501
9	441
10	446, 478

Hen.		Hen.		Hen.	
14, 2	431	26, 4	436, 511	52, 2	170
4	356	5	393, 426, 511	3	334, 499
6	169, 226, 292	27, 5	543	4	446
7	517	28, 2	377, 393, 398 <i>bis</i> , 412, 554, 555	5	432
10, 11	496	29, 2	471	7	266, 494
12	534	30, 1	509	8	513
15	473	31, 3	433	9	170
18	426	32, 2	398, 402, 480	58, 3	315, 316
19	401, 426, 491	3	478, 485, 523	4	315, 316, 516
21	456 <i>bis</i> , 512	5	521	6	245
22	461	6	295, 360, 480	7	447
24	523	33, 2	380	54, 5	438
25	483, 503	3	533	6	447, 505
15, 1	480	34, 2	374, 484	55, 3	539
2	509	36, 4	478	4	171
3	480	37, 3	329, 455	56, 1	229, 493
4	336, 521	4	495	2	331
5	397, 398	5	407	4	473
6	463	38, 2	500	5	395
7	413, 506	3	501	7	398
11	33	4	377, 505	8	357
16, 1	380	6	343, 377	57, 2	494
3	413	39, 5	501, 504	58, 3	493
4	415	6	511, 512	5	540
17, 1	380	8	456	59, 1	391
4	534	9	433	2	299, 418
7	328	10	447	60, 1	490
8	357	11	493	5	517
18, 4	445	12	519	7, 8	285
6	535	40, 1	368, 372, 511, 512	61, 1	316
10	404	2	474	62, 4	455
12	508, 511	3	488	10	415
19, 1	267, 546	5	428, 484	15	169
2	266	8	334, 499	63, 1	393, 531
20, 5	273, 399, 461	9	463	3	342
6	274	41, 2	485, 493, 538, 542	4	173, 540
7	306	3	380	5	521
21, 4	336	4	393	6	476
5	516	5	342, 379, 400, 436, 469	10	269, 433, 454
6	372, 471	7	391	65, 1	485, 542
7	513, 536	8	342	2	372
8	379, 474, 496	43, 2	507	3	417
22, 1	323	44, —	358	4	401
2	474, 496	45, 3	547	5	433
3	329, 491	4, 5	446	6	298
4	398, 405	46, 1	529	12	478
6 <i>bis</i>	516	8	245	67, 9	555
8	461	47, 3	342	11	342
11	473	4	494	13	478
14	519	48, 1	433	68, 2	471
23, 2	382	2	404, 484	5	513
3	517	3	502, 545	69, 1	212
24, 3	462	6	545	6	296
5	474 <i>bis</i> , 496	8	169	11	441, 525
6	398	9	471	14	456
25, 3	530	49, 2	493	70, 3	315, 316
4	495, 509, 511, 545	3	529	71, 1	494
6	483, 471, 502	4	462	2	476
7	361	50, 2	494	8	372
26, 2	401	5	377	12	296, 329
2—4	426			13	372, 487
3	471, 511			72, 1	374, 395, 465, 499

Hen.		Hen.		Hen.	
72,	2 . . . 358, 468, 480	89,	10 . . . 237, 306	108,	3 404
	3 . 332, 374, 487, 533		15 . 188, 457, 540		9 433
	4 363, 444		19 377		10 512
	5 . . . 332, 393, 531		20 405		11 206, 207
	6 <i>sqq.</i> 402		25 387	104,	5 . . 171 <i>bis</i> , 510
	7 529		29 331		7 170
	8 384		39 404		9 261
	9 395		40 542	105,	1 296
	13, 15 391		43 181, 252	106,	3 357
	20 400		44 331, 404		6 537, 539
	25 389, 490		46 526		12 189
	32 371		48 261		13 167, 273
	36 390		51 331, 542		16 336
73,	1 391		57 495		17 509
	2 . . . 244, 358, 373		58 193, 542		18 170
	5 373		59 374	107,	1 507
	6—8 373		60 331, 390		3 266
74,	1 469		62 361, 495	108,	13, 14 132
	3 373		63 515		
	14 432		67 542	Kebra Nag. (= <i>Kebra</i> <i>Nagast</i> , ed. BEZOLD, 1905)	
75,	3 445		70 342		
76,	6 283		72 457, 540	<i>Introd.</i>	
77,	1 439		75 376	XIV 47, 246	
	3 432		77 342	XV 31	
	8 371	90,	2 306	XVI . . . 99, 210, 266,	
78,	4 373		4 512	293, 342, 353,	
	6 371		11 526	355, 377, 481	
	7 373		23 485, 538	XVII . 91, 96, 97, 104,	
	14 441	91,	16 372	182, 184, 267,	
	15 254	92,	5 512	367, 368, 405	
	17 517	93,	2 330	XVIII . 317, 347, 348,	
81,	3 527		3 415, 545	349, 462, 486	
	4 483		5 446	XIX 524, 544	
	7, 8 507		8 184	XX . 168, 383, 444, 551 <i>ter</i>	
82,	1 330		9 496	XXV 258	
	7 385, 447		10 372	XXVIIIa 100	
	11 399		11 457, 516	XXIXb 317	
	20 400		14 512	XXXa 233, 248	
83,	1 483	94,	1, 3 527	XXXI 178, 482	
	3 . . . 485, 524, 538		7 359	XXXIIa 298	
	4 . . . 485, 507, 542		8 399	XXXIV 422	
	6 379	95,	1 . . 399, 521, 542	(Glossary) . . . 83, 447	
	7 170, 538		2 524	<hr/> Gen. References . 52, 53,	
	10 377		7 470		
84,	3 509	96,	2 306	275	
	6 446, 528	97,	2 399	4a21 <i>sqq.</i> 501	
85,	3 285, 504		3 171	5a22 446	
	4 405		8 433	12b11 227	
	5 330		8 538	b16 268	
	6 452, 478	98,	4 555	Note 14 321	
86,	2 313		6 538	25b6 477	
	4 297		7 170	Note 23 208	
	6 415		8 538	Note 26 417	
87,	1 457, 540		12 171	27b11 499	
	4 315, 316		15 506	30b21 515	
88,	1 496	99,	1 . . . 169, 261	34a20 <i>sq.</i> 397	
89,	3 316		2 170	39b21 393	
	4 409	100,	5 548	Note 29 54	
	5 328, 376		8 171	43a5 <i>sq.</i> 499	
	6 131	101,	2 171, 335	46b14 457	
	8 376, 442	102,	1 379		
	9 336		5 542		
			9 455		

Kebra Nag.		Kebra Nag.		Kebra Nag.	
50 a1	271	93 b17	305	120 b22	267
52 b3	338	96 a3	268	121 b16	394
54 a18	133	97 a11	363	122 b17 var.	220
b3 sq.	402	a18	426	127 b15 var.	309
55 b14	350	b1, 3	447	129 a20 sqq.	551
b23	271	b10	426	131 a16 sq.	133
56 b7	554	99 b23	351	133 b21	446
57, Note 16	394	101, Note 11	482	135 a24	267
63 a14 sq.	482	102 b20	527	138 a16	281
64 a15	458	105 a20	511	b2	266
65 b3	346	106 a10	266	141 a18	33
66 b2	521	107 b14, 16	517	a19	429
67 b4 sqq.	520	111 b20	285	b18	368
b23	133	112 a21	143	145 a17	188
74 b23 sq.	304	113 b1 var.	519	159, Note 18	34
84 b7	95	Note 14	34	164, Note 26	34
b18	335	114 b20 sq.	452	166 b13 sq.	453
90 b8	206	117 b12	180	169 a4 sq.	382

C. OTHER WORKS AND DOCUMENTS OCCASIONALLY REFERRED TO.

Abushakeri Opus Chronographicum		Chronique de Jean de Nikiou		Cod. Francof. (Josippon) 347	
11	364	70, 4 sq.	512	Cod. Francof. (Tabība Tabībān) 355	
Annales Joh. I (ed. GUIDI, 1903)		116, 5 sq.	519	M. M. (Maṣḥafa Mestīr) f. 192 354	
3, 10	521	183, 19 sq.	519	Cod. Mon. Aeth. II f. 48 v^o 305	
6, 24 sq.	521	Clem. (= Clementis Libri) 204 b 533		f. 49 v ^o 355	
33, 2	427	Codices , specially referred to for their contents, mere orthographic references being omitted: <i>Ms. Berol. M. Berh.</i>		f. 57 v ^o 355	
Ascensio Isaiæ (ed. DILLMANN, 1877)		f. 9 b	465	Contendings of the Apostles (ed. WALLIS BUDGE), Eth. Text	
7, 20, 21	529	f. 12 b	295	14, 16	544
8, 26	529	f. 43 a	359	15, 6	551
9, 21	529	Const. Ap. (Constitutions of the Apostles)		151, 25	551
10, 16	529	II, 39	440	154, 27 sq.	544
11, 16	529	Cyr. (= Cyrilli Alexandrini Scripta) a Reg. in Tüb. Ms.		155, 8	532
Chronique de Ba'eda Māryām (ed. PERUCHON, 1893)		f. 25 b	347	214, 13 sq.	544
140, 8 sqq.	541	Fal. (= Maṣḥafa Fa-lasfā Tabībān)		215, 1 sq.	544
Chronique de Galāw-dēwos (ed. CONZELMAN, 1895)		f. 51	211	371, 16 sq.	544
58, 4 sq.	548	f. 60	394	399, 11 sq.	515
62, 1 sq.	539	Daniel (Apocr.)		1, 64	393
Chronique de Jean de Nikiou = Joh. Ma-dabbar (ed. ZOTENBERG, 1883)					
53, 16 sq.	295				

Didascalia (' <i>The Ethiopic Didascalia</i> ' or ' <i>Constitutions of the Apostles</i> ', ed. PLATT, 1834)	
5, 10	355
17, 3 Note	91
43, 9	323

Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien (D. H. MÜLLER, 1894), besides orthographic references	
20	424
45	409
67 sq.	382
68 (Eth. Bilinguis l. 3)	286
68 and 72	424

Epist. Zar'a Jacob , in LUDOLF'S ' <i>Comm.</i> '	
—	322

Esther (Apocr.)	
3, 14	267

F. N. (= <i>Fetha Nagast</i> , ed. GUIDI)	
—	265

Gadla 'Aragāwī (ed. GUIDI, 1895)	
5	398
6 a 1	273

Gadla Ferē-Mikā'el (ed. TURATIEFF, 1905)	
9, 3	458

Gadla Lālibalā (ed. PERRUCHON, 1892)	
Gen. Ref.	299
39, 12	268
19	268
55, 20	329
56, 4, 19	329
59, 23	329

Gadla Yārēd (ed. CONTI ROSSINI, 1904)	
5, 5	453
29 sq. (= Is. 6, 1)	485
6, 24 sq.	456

Herm. (= <i>Hermae Pastor</i> , ed. D'ABBADIE, 1860)	
22 b 19	348
80	401
81 b 7	184
82 a 13	375
85 a 3	197

Hexaëmeron (ed. TRUMPP, 1882)	
5, 15	416
9, 16 sq.	456
17	416
20	456
15, 3	416
27, 1 sqq.	312
32, 24	539
33, 6	356
36, 20 sq.	168

Histoire des Guerres d' 'Amda Šyōn (ed. PERRUCHON, 1890)	
113, 14 sq.	533

Hom. (= <i>Chrysostomi Homiliae</i>)	
<i>Hom.</i> 80	273

Homilia Jacobi (ed. PEREIRA in ' <i>Oriental. Studien</i> ', 1906)	
892, 4 sq.	548 sq.

Hymnologies	
—	110, 260, 267

Kuf. (= <i>Kufālē</i> or <i>Book of Jubilees</i> , ed. DILLMANN, 1859; cf. ' <i>The Book of Jubilees</i> ', ed. R. H. CHARLES, 1895)	
Gen. Ref. 239, 246, 256, 404	
54 and 59	223
122, N. 4	198
143, 3	72
160, N. 11	198

Lit. (= <i>Liturgies in Rom.</i> N. T.)	
Gen. Ref.	184, 189, 345, 404, 502

Liturgy of the Coptic (and Ethiop.) Church (ed. BEZOLD, in Swainson's ' <i>Greek Liturgies</i> ', 1884)	
383 <i>paen.</i>	467
384, 11	194

Le Livre des Mystères du Ciel et de la Terre (= <i>Mashafa Mestir</i> , ed. PERRUCHON, 1903)	
9, 1	320
16, 3	426
18, 14	374
35, 2 sq.	536

LUDOLF'S ' <i>Gr.</i> '	322
-----------------------------------	-----

Maccabäerbuch, Das Aethiopische (ed. J. HOROVITZ, in ' <i>Zeitschr. f. Assyriol.</i> ', 1906)	
199, 11 sq.	549
229, 31	548

Miracles of the Virgin Mary (ed. WALLIS BUDGE, 1900), Ethiop. Text	
27 b 16 sq.	525

Org. (= <i>Organon Mariae</i>)	
Gen. ref.	193, 199, 269, 285, 320, 334 bis, 382, 466, 484, 546

Phlx. (= <i>Philexius</i>)	
<i>Quaestio</i> 3	381
„ 164	339

Philosophi Abessini (ed. LITTMANN, 1904; cf. <i>Hatatā Zar'a Ya'qōb</i> ed. TURATIEFF, 1904)	
7, 21 sq. (L.) = 9, 2 sq. (T.)	549
9, 2 (L.) = 11, 4 (T.)	361
15, 18 sq. (L.) = 19, 20 sq. (T.)	554
20, 23 (L.) = 26, 23 (T.)	172

Phys. (= <i>Physiologus</i> , ed. HOMMEL, 1877)	
5, 12	356

Revue Semitique , 1905—(<i>Mashafa Dorho</i> , ed. M. Chaine)	
277, 21	431

RÜPPEL'S Axumite Inscriptions (' <i>Reise in Abessinien</i> ', 1838—40, Band II, 403—410)—mere orthographic references being omitted	
I, 1	326
II, 2	326
39	409

Synaxaria (followed severally by the names of their respective months; e.g. '*Sx. Mag.*' is = '*Synaxarion Magābīt*'. The reference generally includes the day of the month, and sometimes points also to the versified *encomium* added to the 'acts'

Synaxaria
of the saint of the
day)
Gen. ref. to *Enc.* 267, 392
Sx. Mag. 8, *Enc.* . . 420
" *Genb.* (= *Gen-*
bōt) 18 397
" *Genb.* 28 347
" *Genb.* 28, *Enc.* . 347
" *Sen.* (= *Senē*) 1,
Enc. 480

Testamentum Adami (ed.
BEZOLD, in '*Oriental.*
Studien', 1906)
899 sqq. 490

Weise Philosophen ('*Das*
Buch der weisen
Philosophen' — COR-
NILL, 1875) = *Mashafa*
Falasfā Tabībān
51 347, 440 sq.

ADDENDUM.

References to brief Footnote-explanations of certain Terms occasionally met with in Works on Semitic Philology.


<i>Absoluter Vorhalt or Logischer Vorhalt</i>	505
<i>Atbash</i>	19
<i>Imāla</i>	182
<i>Mutlaq</i>	264
<i>Vocalanstoß</i>	26

ADDITIONAL CORRECTION.

P. 52, l. 29. The first letter should be—**٧**—.

THE
HISTORICAL EVIDENCES
OF THE
TRUTH OF THE SCRIPTURE RECORDS
STATED ANEW,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE DOUBTS AND
DISCOVERIES OF MODERN TIMES.
IN
EIGHT LECTURES DELIVERED IN THE OXFORD UNI-
VERSITY PULPIT, IN THE YEAR 1850,
ON
The Hampton Foundation.
BY
GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A.,
LATE FELLOW AND TUTOR OF EXETER COLLEGE; EDITOR OF
"THE HISTORY OF HERODOTUS," ETC.
FROM THE LONDON EDITION,
WITH THE NOTES TRANSLATED,
BY REV. A. N. ARNOLD.

BOSTON:
GOULD AND LINCOLN,
57 WASHINGTON STREET.
NEW YORK: SHELDON AND COMPANY.
1875.



Note - This book was originally posted FREE at www.archive.org
Many other Free Ebooks available there.

Books for your consideration

It would be a mistake to suggest that we agree with all of the books we will list below. No book or author is perfect, and neither is this list.

However, there is material in these sources, that do relate to the topic of the book in which this list is found, and these Ebooks are therefore listed for your potential consideration.

Agree or disagree with them, Freedom of Choice and thinking belong to each individual. Make up your own mind.

Codex B and Allies by Hoskier (~~review of~~ [Vaticanus](#), [Sinait](#) and [NKJ V](#))
Relevant to all versions and manuscripts, including Tischendorf, Wescott & Hort, J White, Burgon, Riplinger, Cumbey, etc

Battle for the Bible by Professor Harold Lindsell

All books by John William Burgon, Oxford, including
Revision Revised

New Age Bible Versions by Riplinger (often attacked though not much substantiated against, her own videos are available online and for Free) [Hidden Dangers of Rainbow by C.C. Is an old Standby as is New Age Messiah by same]. A Time of Departing by Youngen, and Deceived on Purpose by Warren Smith are relevant here.

Greek Text for comparison should be the 1550/51 version of Stephens(Estienne) [Textus Receptus] also versions 1860 Scrivener or Cura P.Wilson.

Canon of the Old and New Testaments by Alexander (Princeton)

All Books by George Stanley Faber (watch for other fabers)

All books by Robert D. Wilson

All Books by R.A. Anderson

Sources of the Koran by Sir William Muir is significant in Textual Criticism concerning Apocryphal and Islamic literature, though not always in other contexts.